arXiv:1303.5993v2 [math.DS] 8 Apr 2013

Hausdorff dimension of divergent geodesics on product of hyperbolic spaces

Lei Yang[*]

Abstract

In this article, we consider the diagonal geodesic flows on product of non-compact hyperbolic surfaces of finite volume,i.e., on the product space $\mathrm{T}^1(M_1)\times\cdots\times\mathrm{T}^1(M_k)$ where every M_i is some non-compact hyperbolic surface of finite volume and $\mathrm{T}^1(M_i)$ denotes its unit tangent bundle. And for $x_i \in \mathrm{T}^1(M_i)$, we denote the geodesic flow starting at x_i by $g_t(x_i)$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We want to study the points $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \mathrm{T}^1(M_1)\times\cdots\times\mathrm{T}^1(M_k)$ such that $(g_t(x_1), \ldots, g_t(x_k)) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$. We prove that the set of such points has Hausdorff dimension $3k - \frac{1}{2}$. This work is a generalization of the main results in [2], and the proof involves some interesting results on the distribution of the orbits of discrete group actions on Furstenberg boundary $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$.

1 Introduction

Let M be a non-compact Riemann surface with constant curvature -1 and of finite total volume, and let $\mathrm{T}^1(M)$ denote its unit tangent bundle. It is well known that M can be regarded as the quotient space of the universal hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^2$ by some discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Iso}(\mathbb{H}^2) \cong \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$, say $M \cong \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^2$. Under the condition when M is of finite total volume, $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ is a lattice. And there is a natural identification $\mathrm{T}^1(M) \cong \Gamma\backslash\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$. For simplicity, we denote $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ by G, then $\mathrm{T}^1(M) \cong \Gamma\backslash G$. Through this article, we use the following notations: let $K = \mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{R}) = \left\{\begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\cos\theta & \sin\theta \end{bmatrix} : \theta \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$, $A = \left\{a_t = \begin{bmatrix} e^t & \\ & e^{-t} \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ and let $N = \left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : x \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$. And each point $x \in \mathrm{T}^1(M)$, it determines a point on $y \in M$ and also a direction $v \in \mathrm{T}^1_y(M)$, then starting from x, we have a unique geodesic flow, which is denoted by $\{g_t(x)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. On the $\Gamma \setminus G$ level, the geodesic flow corresponds the action of the one-parameter diagonal subgroup, say $\{a_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, i.e., for $\Gamma x \in \Gamma \setminus G$, the geodesic flow starting from x is just $\{\Gamma x a_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. In

---

[*] Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, email address: `lyang@math.osu.edu`

this article, we study the diagonal geodesic flows on the product space of hyperbolic surfaces (for some technical reason we consider the negative geodesic flows, i.e., t is moving in negative direction, and this is the same as the positive geodesic flows), say $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma_1 \setminus \mathbb{H}^2)\times\cdots\times\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma_k \setminus \mathbb{H}^2) \cong \Gamma_1 \setminus G\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k \setminus G$, and we are interested in the points $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \Gamma_1 \setminus G\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k \setminus G$ such that $(g_{-t}(x_1), \times\cdots\times g_{-t}(x_k)) \to \infty$ as $t \to +\infty$, i.e., for any compact subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \Gamma_1 \setminus G \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus G$, there exists a constant $T(\mathcal{K})$, such that for all $t > T(\mathcal{K})$, $(g_{-t}(x_1), \ldots, g_{-t}(x_k)) \notin \mathcal{K}$. If we denote the collection of such points by $\mathcal{D}_k$, we want to compute the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{D}_k$. For $k = 1$, i.e., on some single hyperbolic surface, it is well known that $g_{-t}(x) \in \Gamma \setminus G \to \infty$ as $t \to +\infty$ if and only if $g_{-t}(x)$ is going toward some cusp part of $\Gamma \setminus G$ and it never escapes the cusp. Therefore for every point $y \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, to make the geodesic flow divergent, the only directions in $\mathrm{T}^1_y(\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2)$ we can choose are the ones whose opposite directions are pointing to the cusps of $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, and thus the set $\mathcal{D}_1$ is of codimension one in $\Gamma \setminus G$. But for $k \geq 2$, the set becomes interesting. Actually, $\mathcal{D}_k$ turns out to be a self-similar Cantor-like subset of the whole space. And in this article, we will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *For any $k \geq 2$, the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{D}_k$,*

$$\dim_H \mathcal{D}_k = 3k - \frac{1}{2}$$

.

The Hausdorff dimension of divergent geodesic trajectories on product of hyperbolic spaces is closely related to that of divergent diagonal flows on homogeneous spaces G/Γ where G denotes some semisimple Lie group and $\Gamma \subset G$ is a lattice of G, and it has many applications in number theory. The reader is referred to [4] and [5] for details in this direction. On the other hand, this topic is also related to the geodesic flows on translation surfaces and Teichmüller flows on moduli spaces of holomorphic quadratic differentials since there is a natural $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$-action on the moduli spaces and the Teichmüller flows correspond to the orbits of the actions under $\{a_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. We refer the reader to [3], [9], [10] and [11] for details about the study in this setting.

This work is inspired by Cheung's results in [2] in which he deals with the case when the discrete subgroups are all equal to the arithmetic subgroup $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$. The main obstacle to generalize from $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ to any lattice Γ is the estimate of the number of cusp points in a given small interval whose heights are in a given range (here the height of a cusp point is defined later and is an analogue of the denominator of a rational point $\frac{p}{q}$, say q). To get such an estimate, we need to apply an effective result of the mixing property of geodesic flows on hyperbolic spaces due to Moore (see [8]).

1.1 SOME BASIC REDUCTION

In this subsection we recall some basic results about group action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ on $\mathbb{H}^2$ and get some trivial reduction of our original problem.

The universal hyperbolic surface is identified with the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}^2 = \{z = x + \imath y : y > 0\}$ with the hyperbolic metric $ds^2 = \frac{dx^2+dy^2}{y^2}$, and $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ acts on $\mathbb{H}^2$ by fractional linear transformation:

for $g = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 & g_2 \\ g_3 & g_4 \end{bmatrix} \in G$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}^2$, $gz = \frac{g_1 z + g_2}{g_3 z + g_4}$. Then if we consider the map: $G \to \mathbb{H}^2$ by sending $g \in G$ to $g\imath \in \mathbb{H}^2$, it is easy to see that the stabilizer of $\imath$ is K, so this map induces an isomorphism $G/K \cong \mathbb{H}^2$. On the tangent bundle, the action is represented as follows: for $g = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 & g_2 \\ g_3 & g_4 \end{bmatrix} \in G$ and $(z, v) \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, then the action $g(z, v) = (\frac{g_1 z + g_2}{g_3 z + g_4}, \frac{v}{(g_3 z + g_4)^2})$. This group action is conformal by the results of fractional linear transformations, i.e., it preserves the hyperbolic metric and also the angles between any two geodesics. Then we can identify G with $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$ by sending $g \in G$ to $g(\imath, \imath) \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$. Under this map we can also identify $\Gamma \setminus G$ with $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2)$ for any non-compact lattice Γ of G. Then for $x \in G \cong \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$, the geodesic flow $\{g_t(x)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is identified with the orbit of the right action of $\{a_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, say $\{x a_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, and on the level of homogeneous space $\Gamma \setminus G$, the geodesic flow starting from Γx is equal to $\{\Gamma x a_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. In this article we insist on studying the negative geodesic flows, i.e., the negative part of the whole geodesic line, say $\{\Gamma x a_{-t}\}_{t > 0}$. Then for any $\Gamma x \in \Gamma \setminus G$, we can decompose $x \in G$ as $x = u^+(x) p^-(x)$, where $p^-(x) \in P^- = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ b & a^{-1} \end{bmatrix} : a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, b \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$ and $u^+(x) \in U^+ = \left\{ u(t) \in \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$. Then since $a_t p^-(x) a_{-t}$ remains bounded for all large t, therefore $a_t p^-(x) a_{-t} \to \xi(x) \in G$ as $t \to +\infty$. Thus on the product space $\Gamma_1 \setminus G \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus G$, $(\Gamma_1 x_1 a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k x_k a_{-t}) \to \infty$ as $t \to +\infty$, then $(\Gamma_1 u^+(x_1) a_{-t} a_t p^-(x_1) a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k u^+(x_k) a_{-t} a_t p^-(x_k) a_{-t}) \to \infty$, and for $a_t p^-(x_i) a_{-t} \to \xi(x_i) \in G$ as $t \to +\infty$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, this implies $(\Gamma_1 u^+(x_1) a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k u^+(x_k) a_{-t})$ also diverges as $t \to +\infty$. Conversely, for the same reason, if $(\Gamma_1 u^+(x_1) a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k u^+(x_k) a_{-t})$ diverges as $t \to +\infty$ then so does $(\Gamma_1 x_1 a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k x_k a_{-t})$ as $t \to +\infty$. Therefore if we define

$$D_k = \{\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : (\Gamma_1 u(x_1) a_{-t}, \dots, \Gamma_k u(x_k) a_{-t}) \to \infty \text{ as } t \to +\infty\} \tag{1}$$

we have $\dim_H \mathcal{D}_k = \dim_H D_k + \dim(P^-)^k = \dim_H D_k + 2k$. And on the level of $\mathbb{H}^2$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the flow $\{u(x) a_{-t}\}_{t > 0}$ corresponds to the half geodesic ray $\{x + e^{-2t}\imath : t > 0\}$, then we have

$$D_k = \{\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : \Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \backslash (x_1 + \imath e^{-2t}, \dots, x_k + \imath e^{-2t}) \text{ diverges as } t \to +\infty \text{ in } \Gamma_1 \backslash \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \backslash \mathbb{H}^2\} \tag{2}$$

And our original problem can be reduced to proving that $\dim_H D_k \geq k - \frac{1}{2}$ and $\dim_H D_2 = \frac{3}{2}$.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we give some basic results concerning the geodesic flows on a single hyperbolic surface $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$ and the cusp points of Γ, and deduce the conditions when a geodesic flow can be close to a cusp of Γ; in Section 3, we prove a technical result concerning the estimate of the number of cusp points of Γ in a small interval $I = [x - d, x + d]$ with heights within some range $[c_1 h, c_2 h]$; and in Section 4 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1, the first subsection concerns the lower bound of Hausdorff dimension, the proof depends on the result in Section 3 and the second one concerns the upper bound, the proof needs a basic estimate about cusps in [**?**].

Remark: the main ideas and most arguments in this paper also work for studying the divergent geodesic flows on products of hyperbolic spaces of any dimension n, i.e., $\{(g_{-t}(x_1), \dots, g_{-t}(x_k))\}_{t > 0} \subset \mathrm{T}^1(M_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{T}^1(M_k)$, where $M_i \cong \Gamma_i \setminus \mathbb{H}^n$ is some non-compact hyperbolic space with finite total volume, for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. In a sequent paper, we will prove a similar result in this setting.

2 GEODESIC FLOWS ON $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$

In this section, we denote $G = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, and $\Gamma \subset G$ some lattice of G. We may identify G with unit tangent bundle of the universal hyperbolic space, say $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$. Here we use the upper half space model, the the ideal boundary of $\mathbb{H}^2$, denoted by $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$, is identified with $\mathbb{R} \cup \infty$. The diagonal flow $u(x)a_{-t}$ corresponds to a geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$ joining $\infty \in \partial\mathbb{H}^2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R} \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^2$. Then to study the quotient space $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, we may divide $\mathbb{H}^2$ into countably many fundamental domains with respect to the Γ-action. Up to a conjugation, we may assume some fundamental domain has ∞ as one of its cusps, among all the fundamental domains sharing ∞ as a cusp, we choose one, and denote it by D_0, such that $0 \in \mathbb{R} \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^2$ is not a cusp of D_0. We denote all cusps of D_0 by $a_1 = \infty, a_2, \ldots, a_m$, suppose the boundary of D_0 has n sides, then from a basic result of fundamental domains of $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, we may pair all sides of D_0 in the following way: $\{(e_i, e_i^{'}, s_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $e_i, e_i^{'}$ are sides of D_0 and $s_i \in \Gamma$, such that for each i, $s_i(e_i) = e_i^{'}$. Note that in this pairing notation, we put both $(e_i, e_i^{'}, s_i)$ and $(e_i^{'}, e_i, s_i^{-1})$ into our collection. And if we put $S = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^n$, then a well known result is that S generates Γ (see [1]). Next, we divide D_0 into m parts using only geodesic segments$\{P_j\}_{j=1}^m$, such that each part P_j is connected and has only one cusp a_j, then for any point $z \in P_j \subset D_0$, we say z is near a_j, or close to a_j. Then by dividing any fundamental domain γD_0 where $\gamma \in \Gamma$ via γP_j, similarly if $z \in \gamma P_j$ then we say z is near γa_i. For a geodesic flow $\mathcal{G}$, if at some moment it moves into γP_j, then we say at this moment $\mathcal{G}$ enters the cusp γa_i.

For any cusp a_i, we have the subgroup $\Gamma_{a_i} \subset \Gamma$ is nontrivial, where Γ_{a_i} denotes the group of elements in Γ which fix the cusp a_i. Then for $a_1 = \infty$, $\Gamma_\infty = \left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & kl_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$, for some $l_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, without loss of generality (take a conjugation of Γ if necessary), we may assume $l_1 = 1$, i.e., $\Gamma_\infty = \left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & k \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$. For general a_i, Γ_{a_i} is of form $\left\{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{a_i} & 1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & kl_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i} & kl_i \\ -\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} & 1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i} \end{bmatrix} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$ for some $l_i \in \mathbb{R}$. For any geodesic flow $\mathcal{G}$ that once enters D_0 and near a_i at some moment, then the next cusp $\mathcal{G}$ enters will be of form $u_i(k)s_ja_q$, where $u_i(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i} & kl_i \\ -\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} & 1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i} \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_{a_i}$ and $s_j \in S \cup \{e\}$ where e stands for the identity of G, but $s_ja_q \neq a_i$. In fact, $\mathcal{G}$ can spend some time near a_i, going through several fundamental domains near a_i, say from D_0 to $u_i(k)D_0$ and then enter another cusp of D_0, or enter another nearby fundamental domain, which is of form $u_i(k)s_jD_0$ for some $s_j \in S$. When the formal happens then we put $s_j = e$ and thus have the above statement. Then by transforming D_0 to γD_0 via γ, we have the following: for any cusp γa_i, if a geodesic flow $\mathcal{G}$ is near γa_i at some moment, then the next cusp $\mathcal{G}$ enters must be of form $\gamma u_i(k)s_ja_q$.

For a cusp γa_i, where $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4 \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma$, we define the height of γa_i, denoted by $\|\gamma a_i\| = \sqrt{l_i}|\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}|$, in fact, it is just the lower left entry of $\begin{bmatrix}\gamma_1 & \gamma_2\\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i} & 0\\ \frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) & \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\gamma_2\\ \sqrt{l_i}(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) & \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\gamma_4\end{bmatrix}$. And also we note that $\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i} & 0\\ \sqrt{l_i}\frac{1}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\end{bmatrix}^{-1}\Gamma_{a_i}\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i} & 0\\ \sqrt{l_i}\frac{1}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\end{bmatrix} = \Gamma_\infty$. In particular, if $a_i = \infty$, then $\|\gamma\infty\| = |\gamma_3|$. But for a fixed cusp γa_i, the choice of γ is flexible, in fact, we can choose any element in the coset $\gamma\Gamma_{a_i}$. In this article we choose γ in the following way: For each cusp a_i of D_0, we choose a neighborhood Θ_i of a_i in $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$, for $a_1 = \infty$, the neighborhood we choose should be $\Theta_1 = (-\infty, -M) \cup (M, \infty)$ for some large number $M > 0$. Then for a fixed cusp γa_i we choose γ such that $\gamma^{-1}\infty \notin \Theta_i$. This always can be done since if $\gamma^{-1}\infty \in \Theta_i$, then we apply $u_i(k)$ to get $u_i(k)\gamma^{-1}\infty$, for a suitable k, we may move it out of Θ_i. For the case of $a_1 = \infty$, the picture is very clear: if $|\gamma^{-1}\infty|$ is larger than M, then we apply $u_1(k)$ to get $u_1(k)\gamma^{-1}\infty = \gamma^{-1}\infty + k$, this is pure translation, then obviously we can make $|\gamma^{-1}\infty|$ smaller than M for suitable k. For general case of a_i, we translate Θ_i via $\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}$ to $\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\Theta_i$ which is a neighborhood of ∞. Then if $\gamma^{-1}\infty \in \Theta_i$, then $\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\gamma^{-1}\infty$ is near ∞, then we may choose suitable k to make $\begin{bmatrix}1 & kl_i\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\gamma^{-1}\infty = \begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\gamma^{-1}\infty + kl_i$ away from ∞. Thus $\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ \frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & kl_i\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ -\frac{1}{a_i} & 1\end{bmatrix}\gamma^{-1}\infty$ will be out of Θ_i, i.e., $u_i(k)\gamma^{-1}\infty \notin \Theta_i$. then we replace γ by $\gamma u_i(-k)$, then we make $\gamma^{-1}\infty \notin \Theta_i$.

Near each cusp of D_0, say a_i, we can find two horocircles, say C_i and $C_i^{'}$, with radius r_i and $r_i^{'}$, respectively, both through a_i, such that $C_i \subset \Gamma_{a_i}P_i \subset C_i^{'}$. A point $x + y\imath \in \mathbb{H}^2$ in inside C_i (and $C_i^{'}$ respectively), if and only if $(x - a_i)^2 + y^2 < 2r_i y$ (and $(x - a_i)^2 + y^2 < 2r_i^{'}y$ respectively). On the other hand, if we apply $\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}\end{bmatrix}$ acting on $x + y\imath$, we get $\frac{x+y\imath}{-\frac{l_i}{a_i}(x+y\imath)+l_i} = \frac{a_i x+a_i y\imath}{l_i(a_i-x)-l_i y\imath}$, and its imaginary part is $\Im\frac{a_i x+a_i y\imath}{l_i(a_i-x)-l_i y\imath} = \Im\frac{(a_i x+a_i y\imath)((a_i-x)+y\imath)}{l_i(a_i-x)^2+l_i y^2} = \frac{a_i^2 y}{l_i(x-a_i)^2+l_i y^2}$. Thus if $x + y\imath \in C_i$ (and $x + y\imath \in C_i^{'}$ respectively), then we have $\Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}\end{bmatrix}(x + y\imath) = \frac{a_i^2 y}{l_i(x-a_i)^2+l_i y^2} > \frac{a_i^2}{2l_i r_i}$ ($> \frac{a_i^2}{2l_i r_i^{'}}$ respectively). From the above calculation, we have the following:

Proposition 2.1. *For each cusp a_i of D_0, there exist two constants, depending only on Γ, $c_i(= \frac{a_i^2}{2l_i r_i})$ and $c_i^{'}(= \frac{a_i^2}{2l_i r_i^{'}})$, such that, if $\Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}\end{bmatrix}(x + y\imath) > c_i$, then $x + y\imath$ is near a_i, and if $x + y\imath$ is near a_i, then $\Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}\end{bmatrix}(x + y\imath) > c_i^{'}$. Here conventionally we put $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$.*

Now, for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{R} \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^2$, we denote $\mathcal{G}_x$ the geodesic flow joining ∞ and x, which corresponds to the diagonal flow $u(x)a_{-t}$ (let $u(x)a_{-s}$ act on $\imath$), then the element $u(x)a_{-s}$ corresponds to the point $x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2s}}$, it is near γa_i (i.e., $x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2s}} \in \gamma P_i$) if and only if $\gamma^{-1}(x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2s}})$ is near a_i, and then we may apply the above proposition. So we need to calculate $\Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i}\end{bmatrix}\gamma^{-1}(x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2s}})$. Suppose $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix}\gamma_1 & \gamma_2\\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4\end{bmatrix}$, then

$\begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i} \end{bmatrix} \gamma^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\gamma_4 & -\sqrt{l_i}^{-1}\gamma_2 \\ \sqrt{l_i}(-\gamma_3 - \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) & \sqrt{l_i}(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) \end{bmatrix}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i} \end{bmatrix} \gamma^{-1}(x + \tfrac{\iota}{e^{2s}}) &= \frac{1}{l_i}\frac{(\gamma_4 x - \gamma_2) + \gamma_4 e^{-2s}\iota}{(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) - (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})e^{-2s}\iota} \\ &= \frac{1}{l_i}\frac{[(\gamma_4 x - \gamma_2) + \gamma_4 e^{-2s}\iota][(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) + (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})e^{-2s}\iota]}{[(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})]^2 + (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})^2 e^{-4s}} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and its imaginary part is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Im \frac{1}{l_i}\frac{[(\gamma_4 x - \gamma_2) + \gamma_4 e^{-2s}\iota][(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) + (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})e^{-2s}\iota]}{[(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})]^2 + (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})^2 e^{-4s}} &= \frac{1}{l_i}\frac{(\gamma_4 x - \gamma_2)(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})e^{-2s} + \gamma_4 e^{-2s}[(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})]}{[(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})]^2 + (\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})^2 e^{-4s}} \\ &= \frac{e^{-2s}(\gamma_3\gamma_4 x + \gamma_4^2 x/a_i - \gamma_2\gamma_3 - \gamma_2\gamma_4/a_i + \gamma_1\gamma_4 + \gamma_2\gamma_4/a_i - \gamma_3\gamma_4 x - \gamma_4^2 x/a_i)}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2(|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-4s})} \\ &= \frac{e^{-2s}(\gamma_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma_3)}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2(|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-4s})} \\ &= \frac{e^{-2s}}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2(|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-4s})} \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2(e^{2s}|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-2s})} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In above, $l_i[(\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}) - x(\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i})]^2 = \|\gamma a_i\|^2|x - \gamma a_i|^2$ since $\|\gamma a_i\| = \sqrt{l_i}|\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}|$, $\gamma a_i = \frac{\gamma_1 a_i + \gamma_2}{\gamma_3 a_i + \gamma_4} = \frac{\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}}{\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}}$, and $\gamma_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma_3 = 1$ since $\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$.

When $e^{2s} = \frac{1}{|x - \gamma a_i|}$, the imaginary part can obtain its maximum $\frac{1}{2\|\gamma a_i\|^2|x - \gamma a_i|}$. Therefore we have the following proposition:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}_x$, c_i and $c_i^{'}$ be defined as above. For each cusp γa_i, $\mathcal{G}_x$ is near γa_i at some moment if*

$$\frac{1}{2\|\gamma a_i\|^2|x - \gamma a_i|} > c_i$$

. Conversely, if $\mathcal{G}_x$ is near γa_i at some moment, then we have

$$\frac{1}{2\|\gamma a_i\|^2|x - \gamma a_i|} > c_i^{'}$$

Remark: The above statement can be regarded as an analogue of the condition under which a rational fraction $\frac{p}{q}$ is among the continued fractions of some real number x.

For simplicity, we call $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters γa_i deeply if $\frac{1}{2\|\gamma a_i\|^2|x - \gamma a_i|} > c_i$.

We denote $A \asymp B$ if there exist two positive constants ω and $\omega^{'}$ (only depending on Γ), such that $\omega B \leq A \leq \omega^{'} B$; and we denote $A \ll B$ ($A \gg B$ respectively) if only the right part (left part respectively) of the previous inequality holds.

Suppose at some moment $\mathcal{G}_x$ is near γa_i, and it leaves γa_i after a while, then the next cusp it enters must be of form $\gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q$ from the above discussion, where $u_i(k)$, s_j and a_q are defined as above. If we put $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4 \end{bmatrix}$ and $s_j = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_j & \beta_j \\ \tau_j & \rho_j \end{bmatrix}$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma u_i(k) s_j &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i} & kl_i \\ -\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} & 1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_j & \beta_j \\ \tau_j & \rho_j \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1[\alpha_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \tau_j kl_i] + \gamma_2[-\alpha_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \tau_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] & \gamma_1[\beta_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \rho_j kl_i] + \gamma_2[-\beta_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \rho_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] \\ \gamma_3[\alpha_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \tau_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\alpha_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \tau_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] & \gamma_3[\beta_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \rho_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\beta_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \rho_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Then we have:

$$\gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q = \frac{\gamma_1[\alpha_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \tau_j kl_i] + \gamma_2[-\alpha_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \tau_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] + \frac{1}{a_q}\{\gamma_1[\beta_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \rho_j kl_i] + \gamma_2[-\beta_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \rho_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})]\}}{\gamma_3[\alpha_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \tau_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\alpha_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \tau_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] + \frac{1}{a_q}\{\gamma_3[\beta_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \rho_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\beta_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \rho_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})]\}} \tag{6}$$

and its height

$$\begin{aligned} ||\gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q|| &= \sqrt{l_q}|\gamma_3[\alpha_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \tau_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\alpha_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \tau_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})] + \frac{1}{a_q}\{\gamma_3[\beta_j(1 - \frac{kl_i}{a_i}) + \rho_j kl_i] + \gamma_4[-\beta_j \frac{kl_i}{a_i^2} + \rho_j(1 + \frac{kl_i}{a_i})]\}| \\ &= \sqrt{l_q}|kl_i[(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q}) - \frac{1}{a_i}(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q})](\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}) + \gamma_3(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \gamma_4(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q})| \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Since $\sqrt{l_q}\sqrt{l_i}|(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q}) - \frac{1}{a_i}(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q})| = ||s_j a_q|| ||a_i|| |a_i - s_j a_q|$, especially, if $a_i = \infty$, it will become $||s_j a_q||$, if $s_j a_q = \infty$, i.e., $s_j = e$ and $a_q = a_1 = \infty$, it will become $||a_i||$.

Then since $|a_i - s_j a_q| ||s_j a_q|| ||a_i||$ is bounded from both above and from below (including the above two extreme cases), in fact there are only finitely many choices for a_i, s_j and a_q, thus in the above expression the coefficient of k, which we denote by $\Omega(k)$, can be compared with $\sqrt{l_i}|\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}| = ||\gamma a_i||$, i.e., $\Omega(k) \asymp ||\gamma a_i||$.

In the expression of $\gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q$, the remainder except $\Omega(k)k$ is $\gamma_3(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \gamma_4(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q})$. To estimate $||\gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q||$, we need to prove the following inequality:

$$|\gamma_3(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \gamma_4(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q})| \ll |\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}| \tag{8}$$

Proof of (8). We prove it by contradiction. Suppose for each integer $n > 0$, there exist $\gamma(n) = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1(n) & \gamma_2(n) \\ \gamma_3(n) & \gamma_4(n) \end{bmatrix}$, $a_i(n)$, $s_j(n) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_j(n) & \beta_j(n) \\ \tau_j(n) & \rho_j(n) \end{bmatrix}$ and $a_q(n)$, such that

$$|\gamma_3(n)(\alpha_j(n) + \frac{\beta_j(n)}{a_q(n)}) + \gamma_4(n)(\tau_j(n) + \frac{\rho_j(n)}{a_q(n)})| > n|\gamma_3(n) + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{a_i(n)}| \tag{9}$$

Since there are only finitely many choices for $a_i(n)$ $s_j(n)$ and $a_q(n)$, by passing to a subsequence, we may assume they remain the same, say equal to a_i s_j and a_q, respectively. And then by choose a subsequence again we may assume that $|\gamma_3(n)| \geq |\gamma_4(n)|$ always true or $|\gamma_3(n)| \leq |\gamma_4(n)|$ always true. If this is the formal case. Therefore by dividing both sides by $|\gamma_3(n)|$ the above inequality becomes:

$$|(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)}(\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q})| > n|1 + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)}\frac{1}{a_i}| \tag{10}$$

Since $|\frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)}| \leq 1$, the left hand side remains uniformly bounded for any n, thus the only case to make the inequality hold is that $1 + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)}\frac{1}{a_i} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, i.e., $-\frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)} \to a_i$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $-\frac{\gamma_4(n)}{\gamma_3(n)} = \gamma(n)^{-1}\infty$, we have $\gamma(n)^{-1}\infty \to a_i$. This contradicts our choice of $\gamma(n)$ since previously we choose γ such that $\gamma^{-1}\infty \notin \Theta_i \ni a_i$.

If this is the latter case, then we divide both sides of the inequality by $|\gamma_4(n)|$ to get

$$|\frac{\gamma_3(n)}{\gamma_4(n)}(\alpha_j + \frac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + (\tau_j + \frac{\rho_j}{a_q})| > n|\frac{\gamma_3(n)}{\gamma_4(n)} + \frac{1}{a_i}| \tag{11}$$

Then we get the left hand side remains uniformly bounded, and thus $\frac{\gamma_3(n)}{\gamma_4(n)} + \frac{1}{a_i} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. So we get the same statement as in the formal case and thus the same contradiction.

This completes the proof. $\square$

Combining $\Omega(k) \asymp ||\gamma a_i||$ and the inequality (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| &= |\Omega(k)k + \gamma_3(\alpha_j\tfrac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \gamma_4(\tau_j + \tfrac{\rho_j}{a_q})| \\
&\leq |\Omega(k)||k| + |\gamma_3(\alpha_j\tfrac{\beta_j}{a_q}) + \gamma_4(\tau_j + \tfrac{\rho_j}{a_q})| \\
&\ll |k|||\gamma a_i|| + Const.||\gamma a_i|| \\
&\ll |k|||\gamma a_i||
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

And for lower bound of $||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q||$, we have that there exists some large integer N such that for $|k| \geq N$ the following estimate of $||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q||$ holds:

$$||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| \gg k||\gamma a_i|| \tag{13}$$

Combing them, we have for $|k| \geq N$, the following estimate holds:

$$||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| \asymp |k|||\gamma a_i|| \tag{14}$$

For $|k| < N$, we will prove the same estimate:

$$||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| \asymp |k|||\gamma a_i|| \tag{15}$$

The upper bound has been proved, so we only need the lower bound, i.e., there exists some constant, *Const.*, such that

$$||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| \geq Const.|k|||\gamma a_i|| \tag{16}$$

where $|k| < N$. But note that we do not prove this for arbitrary a_i, k, s_j and a_q, instead, we will only prove this for γa_i and $\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q$ such that there exists some geodesic $\mathcal{G}_x = \{x + \frac{i}{e^{2s}}\}_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$, which enters γa_i and after a while it leaves γa_i for $\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q$. And since we assume $|k|$ is bounded, in the above inequality the factor $|k|$ is unnecessary. Thus it suffices to prove the following:

Lemma 2.1. *There exists some constant Const., such that if some geodesic $\mathcal{G}_x = \{x + \frac{i}{e^{2s}}\}_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ enters γa_i when $s = t$ and leaves it for $\gamma' a_q$ when $s = t'$, then $||\gamma' a_q|| \geq Const.||\gamma a_i||$*

Proof. At first, we claim that there exists some constant Λ, such that $e^{2t} < \Lambda \frac{1}{|x-\gamma a_i|}$. If $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters γa_i deeply, then the conclusion is already there since at $e^{2s} = \frac{1}{|x-\gamma a_i|}$, $\mathcal{G}_x$ is already near γa_i, then $e^{2t} < \frac{1}{|x-\gamma a_i|}$. If $\mathcal{G}_x$ does not enter γa_i deeply, then we have $||\gamma a_i||^2|x - \gamma a_i| \geq \frac{1}{2c_i}$, and $x + \frac{i}{e^{2t}}$ is near γa_i implies $e^{2t}|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-2t} < \frac{1}{2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2}$, which implies $e^{2t}|x - \gamma a_i|^2 < \frac{1}{2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2}$, and therefore $e^{2t}|x - \gamma a_i| < \frac{1}{2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2|x-\gamma a_i|} \leq \frac{2c_i}{2c_i^{'}}$. This proves that $e^{2t} < \frac{c_i}{c_i^{'}} \frac{1}{|x-\gamma a_i|}$. Therefore we prove the claim. Then for the same reason, $e^{2t^{'}} < \Lambda \frac{1}{|x-\gamma^{'} a_q|}$.

Now from the conditions we know that $e^{2t}|x - \gamma a_i|^2 + e^{-2t} < \frac{1}{2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2}$ and $e^{2t^{'}}|x - \gamma^{'} a_q|^2 + e^{-2t^{'}} \geq \frac{1}{2c_q||\gamma^{'} a_q||^2}$. Since $e^{2t^{'}} < \Lambda \frac{1}{|x-\gamma^{'} a_q|}$, we have $e^{2t^{'}}|x - \gamma^{'} a_q|^2 < \Lambda^2 e^{-2t^{'}}$, and then the latter inequality above implies $(\Lambda^2 + 1)e^{-2t^{'}} > \frac{1}{2c_q||\gamma^{'} a_q||^2}$, then $e^{2t^{'}} < 2(1 + \Lambda^2)c_q||\gamma^{'} a_q||^2$. And from the formal inequality above we have $e^{-2t} < \frac{1}{2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2}$ (here we just drop a positive term $e^{2t}|x - \gamma a_i|^2$ from the left hand side), i.e., $e^{2t} > 2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2$. And since $t^{'} > t$, then we have $2(1 + \Lambda^2)c_q||\gamma^{'} a_q||^2 > 2c_i^{'}||\gamma a_i||^2$, which leads the conclusion immediately.

This proves the lemma. ☐

Combing both of them, we have for arbitrary γ a_i k and a_q, the following holds:

$$||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q|| \asymp |k|||\gamma a_i|| \tag{17}$$

The distance between γa_i and $\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q$ is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}|\gamma a_i - \gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q| &= \left| \frac{\gamma_1+\frac{\gamma_2}{a_i}}{\gamma_3+\frac{\gamma_4}{a_i}} - \frac{\gamma_1[\alpha_j(1-\frac{kl_i}{a_i})+\tau_j kl_i]+\gamma_2[-\alpha_j\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2}+\tau_j(1+\frac{kl_i}{a_i})]+\frac{1}{a_q}\{\gamma_1[\beta_j(1-\frac{kl_i}{a_i})+\rho_j kl_i]+\gamma_2[-\beta_j\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2}+\rho_j(1+\frac{kl_i}{a_i})]\}}{\gamma_3[\alpha_j(1-\frac{kl_i}{a_i})+\tau_j kl_i]+\gamma_4[-\alpha_j\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2}+\tau_j(1+\frac{kl_i}{a_i})]+\frac{1}{a_q}\{\gamma_3[\beta_j(1-\frac{kl_i}{a_i})+\rho_j kl_i]+\gamma_4[-\beta_j\frac{kl_i}{a_i^2}+\rho_j(1+\frac{kl_i}{a_i})]\}} \right| \\ &= \frac{||s_j a_q||||a_i|||a_i - s_j a_q|}{||\gamma a_i||||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q||}\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

As we have done above, if $a_i = \infty$, the final line will become $\frac{||s_j a_q||}{||\gamma a_i||||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q||}$, if $s_j a_q = \infty$, i.e., $s_j = e$ and $a_q = a_1 = \infty$, then the final line will become $\frac{||a_i||}{||\gamma a_i||||\gamma u_i(k)\infty||}$. Then $|a_i - s_j a_q|||s_j a_q||||a_i||$ is bounded from both above and from below. This deduces the following:

$$|\gamma a_i - \gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q| \asymp \frac{1}{||\gamma a_i||||\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q||} \tag{19}$$

Combing with the estimate (17), we have the following holds:

$$|\gamma a_i - \gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q| \asymp \frac{1}{|k|||\gamma a_i||^2} \tag{20}$$

Next we study the distance between arbitrary two cusps, γa_j and $\gamma^{'} a_i$.

At first, let us look at a simple case, where $\gamma^{'} = e$.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and cusps of D_0, a_i and a_j, we have*

$$||a_i||||\gamma a_j|||\gamma a_j - a_i| = ||a_j||||\gamma^{-1} a_i|||\gamma^{-1} a_i - a_j| \tag{21}$$

Proof. This follows directly from pure calculation. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
||a_i||||\gamma a_j|||\gamma a_j - a_i| &= \sqrt{l_i}\sqrt{l_j}|\tfrac{1}{a_i}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2/a_j) - (\gamma_3 + \gamma_4/a_j)| \\
&= \sqrt{l_i}\sqrt{l_j}|\tfrac{1}{a_j}(\gamma_4 - \gamma_2/a_i) - (-\gamma_3 + \gamma_1/a_i)| \\
&= ||a_j||||\gamma^{-1}a_i|||\tfrac{-\gamma_4 a_i+\gamma_2}{-\gamma_3 a_i+\gamma_1} - a_j| \\
&= |a_i|||\gamma^{-1}a_i|||\gamma^{-1}a_i - a_j|
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

This proves the lemma. ☐

From the lemma, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 2.3. *There exists some constant Const. such that for any* $\gamma \in \Gamma$, a_i *and* a_j, *we have*

$$||a_i||||\gamma a_j|||\gamma a_j - a_i| \geq Const. \tag{23}$$

Proof. At first, by replacing γ by $u_i(k)\gamma$ for some suitable k, we can make $u_i(k)\gamma a_j \notin \Theta_i$. And this replacement does not change $\gamma^{-1}a_i$ so does not change the value $||a_j||||\gamma^{-1}a_i|||\gamma^{-1}a_i - a_j|$ which equals $||a_i||||\gamma a_j|||a_i - \gamma a_j|$. This shows that this replacement does not change the value $||a_i||||\gamma a_j|||\gamma a_j - a_i|$. Then we can assume that there exists a constant λ such that $||a_i|||\gamma a_j - a_i| \geq \lambda$. Then it suffices to prove $||\gamma a_j|| \geq Const.$.

Suppose not, then there exists a sequence $\gamma(n) \in \Gamma$ and sequence of cusps of D_0, $a_j(n)$ such that $||\gamma(n)a_j(n)|| > 0$ for any n ($||\gamma a_j|| = 0$ if and only if $a_j = \infty$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_\infty$, and in this case $|\gamma a_j - a_i|||\gamma a_j|| = 1$), and $\gamma(n)a_j(n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Since the choices of $a_j(n)$ are finite, passing to a subsequence we may assume that $a_j(n) = a_j$ remains the same. Then we consider the action of $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ just by linear transformation. Since Γ is a discrete subgroup, and if we denote the stabilizer group of $\left(1, \frac{1}{a_j}\right)$ by U_{a_j}, we have the intersection of U_{a_j} and Γ, $U_{a_j} \cap \Gamma = \Gamma_{a_j}$ which is cocompact in U_{a_j}, this implies that the orbit $\Gamma\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}$ is discrete in $\mathbb{R}^2$. $\gamma(n)\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}\gamma_1(n) + \frac{\gamma_2(n)}{a_j}\\ \gamma_3(n) + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}$. $||\gamma(n)a_j|| \to 0$ tells that the y-coordinate of $\gamma(n)\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}$ tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Since $\begin{bmatrix}1 & k\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_\infty \subset \Gamma$, we can apply $u_1(k(n)) = \begin{bmatrix}1 & k(n)\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}$ on $\gamma(n)\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}$ for some suitable $k(n)$ to remain the y-coordinate and make the x-coordinate $\gamma_1(n) + \frac{\gamma_2(n)}{a_j} + k(\gamma_3(n) + \frac{\gamma_4(n)}{a_j})$ also bounded, this can always be done since $||\gamma(n)a_j|| > 0$. This shows that $\left\{u_1(k(n))\gamma(n)\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, but $||\gamma(n)a_j|| \to 0$ implies the previous set is infinite, which contradicts the fact that $\Gamma\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{1}{a_j}\end{pmatrix}$ is discrete. This proves that $||\gamma a_j|| \geq Const.$.

This completes the proof. ☐

Now let us consider the general case: for two cusps γa_j and $\gamma' a_i$, the distance

$$\begin{aligned}
|\gamma a_j - \gamma' a_i| &= \left| \frac{\gamma_1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{a_j}}{\gamma_3 + \frac{\gamma_4}{a_j}} - \frac{\gamma'_1 + \frac{\gamma'_2}{a_i}}{\gamma'_3 + \frac{\gamma'_4}{a_i}} \right| \\
&= \sqrt{l_i}\sqrt{l_j} \frac{\left| \gamma_1\gamma'_3 + \frac{\gamma_1\gamma'_4}{a_i} + \frac{\gamma_2\gamma'_3}{a_j} + \frac{\gamma_2\gamma'_4}{a_i a_j} - \gamma'_1\gamma_3 - \frac{\gamma'_2\gamma_3}{a_i} - \frac{\gamma'_1\gamma_4}{a_j} - \frac{\gamma'_2\gamma_4}{a_i a_j} \right|}{\|\gamma a_j\| \|\gamma' a_i\|} \\
&= \sqrt{l_i}\sqrt{l_j} \frac{\left| \frac{1}{a_i}[(\gamma_1\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma_2\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_4)] - [(\gamma'_1\gamma_3 - \gamma_1\gamma'_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma'_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma'_3)] \right|}{\|\gamma a_j\| \|\gamma' a_i\|} \\
&= \|a_i\| \sqrt{l_j} \frac{\left| [(\gamma_1\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma_2\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_4)] - a_i[(\gamma'_1\gamma_3 - \gamma_1\gamma'_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma'_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma'_3)] \right|}{\|\gamma a_j\| \|\gamma' a_i\|}
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma'^{-1}\gamma &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma'_4 & -\gamma'_2 \\ -\gamma'_3 & \gamma'_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_3 & \gamma_2\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_4 \\ \gamma'_1\gamma_3 - \gamma_1\gamma'_3 & \gamma'_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma'_3 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Then we have

$$\sqrt{l_j}\left| [(\gamma_1\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma_2\gamma'_4 - \gamma'_2\gamma_4)] - a_i[(\gamma'_1\gamma_3 - \gamma_1\gamma'_3) + \frac{1}{a_j}(\gamma'_1\gamma_4 - \gamma_2\gamma'_3)] \right| = \|\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j\| |\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j - a_i| \tag{26}$$

This shows that

$$|\gamma a_j - \gamma' a_i| = \frac{\|a_i\| \|\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j\| |\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j - a_i|}{\|\gamma a_j\| \|\gamma' a_i\|} \tag{27}$$

Applying Proposition 2.3 with $\gamma'^{-1}\gamma$, a_i and a_j, we have $\|\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j\| |\gamma'^{-1}\gamma a_j - a_i| \gg 1$, and thus get following proposition for general case:

$$|\gamma a_j - \gamma' a_i| \gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma a_j\| \|\gamma' a_i\|} \tag{28}$$

For a geodesic $\mathcal{G}_x$, we have a sequence of cusps $\{\gamma(n)a(n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the geodesic enters them one after another sequently, and we call it the spectrum of x.

We will prove the following estimate of distance between x and $\gamma(n)a(n)$:

$$|x - \gamma(n)a(n)| \asymp \frac{1}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\| \|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|} \tag{29}$$

Proof. Choose a large constant M such that if $|x - \gamma a_i| \leq \frac{1}{M\|\gamma a_i\|^2}$ then $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters γa_i deeply.

If $|x - \gamma(n)a(n)| \geq \frac{1}{M\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2}$ then the statement is already there since $\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\| \gg \|\gamma(n)a(n)\|$. Now we assume $|x - \gamma(n)a(n)| < \frac{1}{M\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2}$, then $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters $\gamma(n)a(n)$ deeply. Then when $\mathcal{G}_x$ leaves $\gamma(n)a(n)$ for $\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)$, say at $s = t_{n+1}$, we have

$$\Im \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l(n)}^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{l(n)}}{a(n)} & \sqrt{l(n)} \end{bmatrix} \gamma(n)^{-1}(x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2t_{n+1}}}) \asymp \Im \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l(n+1)}^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{l(n+1)}}{a(n+1)} & \sqrt{l(n+1)} \end{bmatrix} \gamma(n+1)^{-1}(x + \frac{\imath}{e^{2t_{n+1}}})$$

, i.e.,

$$\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2(e^{2t_{n+1}}|x - \gamma(n)a(n)|^2 + e^{-2t_{n+1}}) \asymp \|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|^2(e^{2t_{n+1}}|x - \gamma(n+1)a(n+1)|^2 + e^{-2t_{n+1}})$$

, and for $\gamma(n)a(n)$, since $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters it deeply, we have $e^{2t_{n+1}} > \frac{1}{|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|}$. This implies on the left hand side of the previous expression, $\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{2t_{n+1}}|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|^2$ is the major term. As we have proved, $e^{2t_{n+1}} \leq \Lambda\frac{1}{|x-\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)|}$ then the right hand side is compared with $\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|^2 e^{-2t_{n+1}}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{2t_{n+1}}|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|^2 &\asymp \|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|^2 e^{-2t_{n+1}}\\ &\asymp \sqrt{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{2t_{n+1}}|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|^2\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|^2 e^{-2t_{n+1}}}\\ &= |x-\gamma(n)a(n)|\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Note that at $s = t_{n+1}$, $\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|^2 e^{-2t_{n+1}}$ is uniformly bounded from both above and below, then we have

$$|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\| \asymp 1$$

This proves the statement. ☐

From the above argument, we can also conclude that the time t_n when $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters $\gamma(n)a(n)$, is asymptotically $\ln\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|$. And moreover, if $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters $\gamma(n)a(n)$ deeply, then at the time $T_n = \frac{1}{2}\ln\frac{1}{|x-\gamma(n)a(n)|}$, $\Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l(n)}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l(n)}}{a(n)} & \sqrt{l(n)}\end{bmatrix}\gamma(n)^{-1}(x+\frac{\iota}{e^{2s}})$ admits its maximum.

From now on, we define the following function for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{W}_x(t) = \Im\begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{l(n)}^{-1} & 0\\ -\frac{\sqrt{l(n)}}{a(n)} & \sqrt{l(n)}\end{bmatrix}\gamma(n)^{-1}(x+\frac{\iota}{e^{2s}})$ when $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$. Then if $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters $\gamma(n)a(n)$ deeply, $W_x(t)$ has a local maximum in $[t_n, t_{n+1})$ at $s = T_n$.

Next, we will prove that for two cusps γa_i and $\gamma' a_q = \gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q$, if $|k|$ is large enough, then any point x very close to $\gamma' a_q$, say the distance between them is much less than $\frac{1}{\|\gamma' a_q\|^2}$ has the following property: $\mathcal{G}_x$ will enter both γa_i and $\gamma' a_q$, and from leaving γa_i to entering $\gamma' a_q$, it at most spends a uniformly bounded time, say s_0. Rigorously, the following proposition will be proved:

Proposition 2.4. *There exist constants N_0, ϵ and s_0, such that for any two cusps γa_i and $\gamma' a_q = \gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q$, where $\gamma \in \Gamma$, a_i and a_q are two cusps of D_0, $u_i(k) \in \Gamma_{a_i}$ and $s_j \in S \cup \{e\}$, if $|k| > N_0$, then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, if $|x-\gamma' a_q| < \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma' a_q\|^2}$, then $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters γa_i and $\gamma' a_q$ in the given order, and from leaving γa_i to entering $\gamma' a_q$, it spends at most s_0.*

Proof. Choose N_0 large enough so that when $|k| > N_0$, $\|\gamma u_i(k)s_j a_q\| \asymp |k|\|\gamma a_i\| \gg \|\gamma a_i\|$, then for any small $\epsilon > 0$, if $|x-\gamma' a_q| < \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma' a_q\|^2}$, then the distance between x and γa_i,

$$\begin{aligned}|x-\gamma a_i| &\geq |\gamma' a_q - \gamma a_i| - |x-\gamma' a_q|\\ &\gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma' a_q\|\|\gamma a_i\|} - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma' a_q\|^2}\\ &\gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma' a_q\|\|\gamma a_i\|}\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Since $\|\gamma' a_q\| \gg \|\gamma a_i\|$.

Conversely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x-\gamma a_i| &\leq |\gamma' a_q - \gamma a_i| + |x - \gamma' a_q| \\ &\ll \tfrac{1}{||\gamma' a_q|| ||\gamma a_i||} + \tfrac{1}{||\gamma' a_q||^2} \\ &\ll \tfrac{1}{||\gamma a_i|| ||\gamma' a_q||} \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

In above, the second inequality is true because $\gamma' a_q = \gamma u_i(k) s_j a_q$ from which it follows $|\gamma a_i - \gamma' a_q| \asymp \frac{1}{||\gamma a_i|| ||\gamma' a_q||}$ as we have proved.

Therefore we have $|x - \gamma a_i| \asymp \frac{1}{||\gamma a_i|| ||\gamma' a_q||}$, then at first $\mathcal{G}_x$ will enter γa_i at some moment, and when it leaves γa_i, say at $s = t$, then the next cusp $\gamma'' a_r$ $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters will have height $||\gamma'' a_r|| \asymp ||\gamma' a_q||$ since $|x - \gamma a_i| \asymp \frac{1}{||\gamma a_i|| ||\gamma'' a_r||}$.

If $\gamma'' a_r = \gamma' a_q$ then there is nothing to prove. Suppose not, then we have

$$||\gamma'' a_r||^2 (e^{2t} |x - \gamma'' a_r|^2 + e^{-2t}) \asymp 1$$

and moreover we have proved $e^{-2t} \gg e^{2t} |x - \gamma'' a_r|^2$, then

$$||\gamma'' a_r||^2 e^{-2t} \asymp 1$$

Combing $||\gamma' a_q|| \asymp ||\gamma'' a_r||$, we have

$$||\gamma' a_q||^2 e^{-2t} \asymp 1$$

which means there exists a constant $Const.$ such that

$$e^{-2t} \leq Const. \frac{1}{||\gamma' a_q||^2}$$

Then there exists a constant $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$e^{-2t-2s_0} \leq \frac{Const.}{e^{2s_0}} \frac{1}{||\gamma' a_q||^2} \leq \frac{1}{2c_q} \frac{1}{||\gamma' a_q||^2}$$

And since $|\gamma' a_q - \gamma'' a_r| >> \frac{1}{||\gamma' a_q|| ||\gamma'' a_r||} \asymp \frac{1}{||\gamma' a_q||^2}$, we can choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that if $|x - \gamma' a_q| < \frac{\epsilon}{||\gamma' a_q||^2}$, then $|x - \gamma'' a_r| \geq \Lambda e^{2s_0} |x - \gamma' a_q|$. This fact combing with $e^{-2t} \geq \frac{1}{\Lambda} |x - \gamma'' a_r|$ implies

$$e^{-2t-2s_0} \geq \frac{1}{\Lambda e^{2s_0}} |x - \gamma'' a_r| \geq |x - \gamma' a_q|$$

Then we have $e^{-2t-2s_0} \geq e^{2t+2s_0} |x - \gamma' a_q|^2$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} ||\gamma' a_q||^2 (e^{2t+2s_0} |x - \gamma' a_q|^2 + e^{-2t-2s_0}) &\leq ||\gamma' a_q||^2 2 e^{-2t-2s_0} \\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{c_q} \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

This shows at time $s = t + s_0$, $\mathcal{G}_x$ has already entered $\gamma' a_q$ deeply, and thus proves the proposition. ☐

For $\sigma > 0$, we define the subset $\Delta_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

Definition 2.1. *$x \in \Delta_\sigma$ if and only if the spectrum of x, $\{\gamma(n) a(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence $\{\gamma'(n) a'(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that the following properties hold:*

1. $\|\gamma'(n)a'(n)\|^{1+\sigma} \leq \|\gamma'(n+1)a'(n+1)\| \leq 2\|\gamma'(n)a'(n)\|^{1+\sigma}$
2. *From $\mathcal{G}_x$ leaving $\gamma'(n)a'(n)$ to entering $\gamma'(n+1)a'(n+1)$, it spends at most s_0, where s_0 is defined as above.*

As a close of this section, we will prove the following proposition concerning Hausdorff dimension of Δ_σ:

Proposition 2.5. *For any $\sigma > 0$, the Hausdorff dimension of Δ_σ, denoted by $\dim_H(\Delta_\sigma)$ is at least $\frac{1}{2+\sigma}$.*

To prove this proposition, we need the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *(See [2]) Consider a Cantor set $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ defined as a nested intersection:*

$$F = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F_j$$

where F_0 is a closed interval and each F_j is a disjoint union of finitely many closed intervals. Let $(m_j)_{j\geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers and $(\epsilon_j)_{j\geq 1}$ a sequence of real numbers that tend to zero monotonically and suppose that for each $j \geq 1$ there are at least m_j intervals of F_j contained in each interval of F_{j-1} and these intervals are separated by gaps of length at least ϵ_j. Then the Hausdorff dimension of F satisfies the lower bound

$$\dim_H F \geq \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\ln(m_1 \cdots m_{j-1})}{-\ln(m_j \epsilon_j)}$$

The proof can be found in [6, Example 4.6].

Proof of Proposition 2.5. For some fixed a_i, we start with some cusp $\gamma(0)a_i$ with $\|\gamma(0)a_i\|$ large enough, and define $F_0 = [\gamma(0)a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^2}, \gamma(0)a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^2}]$, where ϵ is defined as above. Then assuming F_{j-1} has been constructed and every interval of it is of form $[\gamma a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}, \gamma a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}]$, we define F_j inductively as follows:

For each closed interval $I = [\gamma a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}, \gamma a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}]$ of F_{j-1}, for any cusp $\gamma' a_i \in I$, where $\gamma' = \gamma u_i(k)$, for $k > N_0$. Then if we take $I' = [\gamma' a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma' a_i\|^2}, \gamma' a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma' a_i\|^2}]$, then from Proposition 2.4, we have for any $x \in I'$, $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters γa_i and then $\gamma' a_i$, and from leaving γa_i to entering $\gamma' a_i$, it spends at most s_0. Note that we have proved that $\|\gamma u_i(k)a_i\|$ is of form $|\|\gamma a_i\|\Omega(k)k + \Theta(\gamma)|$ where $|\Omega(k)| \asymp 1$, i.e., its height is a linear function of k whose coefficient is more or less $\|\gamma a_i\|$, then there are more or less $\frac{|[\|\gamma a_i\|^{1+\sigma}, 2\|\gamma a_i\|^{1+\sigma}]|}{\|\gamma a_i\|} = \frac{\|\gamma a_i\|^{1+\sigma}}{\|\gamma a_i\|} = \|\gamma a_i\|^\sigma$ choices of k such that $\|\gamma u_i(k)a_i\| \in [\|\gamma a_i\|^{1+\sigma}, 2\|\gamma a_i\|^{1+\sigma}]$. Thus we have at least (up to a constant multiplication) $\|\gamma a_i\|^\sigma$ choices of I', and any two different intervals $I_1' = [\gamma_1' a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma_1' a_i\|^2}, \gamma_1' a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma_1' a_i\|^2}]$ and $I_2' = [\gamma_2' a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma_2' a_i\|^2}, \gamma_2' a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma_2' a_i\|^2}]$, the gap between them is at least $|\gamma_1' a_i - \gamma_2' a_i| - \frac{2\epsilon}{\|\gamma_1' a_i\|\|\gamma_2' a_i\|}$, since $|\gamma_1' a_i - \gamma_2' a_i| \gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma_1' a_i\|\|\gamma_2' a_i\|}$, we have the gap is $\gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma_1' a_i\|\|\gamma_2' a_i\|} \asymp \frac{1}{\|\gamma a_i\|^{2+2\sigma}}$. Then we define F_j by the union of all these I''s.

From this construction, we have for each interval $[\gamma a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}, \gamma a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma a_i\|^2}]$ of F_{j-1}, the height $\|\gamma a_i\| \in [\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}}, 2^{j-1}\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}}]$, then the above argument shows that $m_j \asymp \|\gamma a_i\|^\sigma \geq$

$\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}\sigma}$ and $\epsilon_j \gg \frac{1}{\|\gamma a_i\|^{2+2\sigma}} \geq \frac{1}{2^{(j-1)(2+2\sigma)}\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}(2+2\sigma)}}$. We can put $m_j = \|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}\sigma}$ and $\epsilon_j = \frac{1}{2^{(j-1)(2+2\sigma)}\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}(2+2\sigma)}}$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(m_1\cdots m_{j-1}) &= \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \ln m_k \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \sigma(1+\sigma)^{k-1} \ln \|\gamma(0)a_i\| \\ &= \sigma\frac{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}-1}{(1+\sigma)-1} \ln \|\gamma(0)a_i\| \\ &= ((1+\sigma)^{j-1}-1) \ln \|\gamma(0)a_i\| \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln m_j\epsilon_j &= \ln(\tfrac{1}{m_j\epsilon_j}) = \ln \frac{2^{(j-1)(2+2\sigma)}\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}(2+2\sigma)}}{\|\gamma(0)a_i\|^{(1+\sigma)^{j-1}\sigma}} \\ &= (j-1)(2+2\sigma)\ln 2 + (1+\sigma)^{j-1}(2+\sigma)\ln\|\gamma(0)a_i\| \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\ln(m_1\cdots m_{j-1})}{-\ln m_j\epsilon_j} &= \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{((1+\sigma)^{j-1}-1)\ln\|\gamma(0)a_i\|}{(j-1)(2+2\sigma)\ln 2+(1+\sigma)^{j-1}(2+\sigma)\ln\|\gamma(0)a_i\|} \\ &= \frac{1}{2+\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Then from the above theorem it follows that if we define $F = \bigcap_{j\geq 0} F_j$, then $\dim_H F \geq \frac{1}{2+\sigma}$. On the other hand, for any point $x \in F$, suppose $x \in \bigcap_{j\geq 0} I_j$, where $I_j = [\gamma(j)a_i - \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma(j)a_i\|^2}, \gamma(j)a_i + \frac{\epsilon}{\|\gamma(j)a_i\|^2}]$ is a closed interval of F_j, then from our construction, we have $\|\gamma(j)a_i\| \in [\|\gamma(j-1)a_i\|^{1+\sigma}, 2\|\gamma(j-1)a_i\|^{1+\sigma}]$ and $\gamma(j) = \gamma(j-1)u_i(k(j))$ for $k(j) > N_0$ (in fact $k(j) \asymp \|\gamma(j-1)a_i\|^{\sigma}$), which follows from Proposition 2.4 that $\mathcal{G}_x$ enters $\gamma(j-1)a_i$ and then $\gamma(j)a_i$ and moreover from leaving $\gamma(j-1)a_i$ to entering $\gamma(j)a_i$ it spends at most s_0. Then for x, $\{\gamma(j)a_i\}_{j\geq 0}$ can be chosen as the subsequence of the spectrum of x satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1. This shows that $F \subset \Delta_\sigma$.

Thus we prove that $\dim_H \Delta_\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2+\sigma}$. ☐

Remark: this result is a generalization of Lemma 4.3 in [2].

3 EFFECTIVE COUNTING ON CUSPS

In this section, we consider the following counting problem: given a interval $I = [x-d, x+d]$, and some large number h, we wonder if there is an effective estimate about the number of the cusps $\{\gamma\infty \in I : \|\gamma\infty\| \in [c_1 h, c_2 h]\}$ for some constants c_1 and c_2.

We fix a function $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$ such that $0 \leq f \leq 1$ and it is supported on a neighborhood Ω of e, such that Ω is contained in $D_0 \times K_\epsilon$, where D_0 is a fundamental domain of Γ-action on $\mathbb{H}^2$, and $K_\epsilon \subset K$ is a neighborhood of e in K. If we represent every element in K by $e(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{bmatrix}$, we can choose $K_\epsilon = \{e(\theta) : \theta \in [-\pi/10, \pi/10]\}$. Then we can identify f with its projection onto $C_c^\infty(\Gamma \setminus G)$, and let f satisfy the following conditions: there exists another neighborhood $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ such that $f = 1$ on Ω', we denote by $\mathcal{S}(\psi)$ the Sobolev norm of a function $\psi \in \mathrm{H}^2(\Gamma \setminus G)$. Let R (and L respectively) denote the right (and left, respectively) regular action on $L^2(G)$, i.e., $R(g)\varphi(x) = \varphi(xg)$ (and $L(g)\varphi(x) = \varphi(gx)$) for

$g \in G$ and $\varphi \in L^2(G)$. It is easy to define similarly the regular right action on $L^2(\Gamma \setminus G)$, which is also denoted by $R(g)$. Then there exists a constant κ such that $\frac{S(R(t)f)}{S(f)} \leq \kappa$ for all $t \in K$, for K is compact.

For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we consider the NAK-decomposition of $\gamma = n(\gamma)a(\gamma)k(\gamma)$. Then f and $L(\gamma^{-1})f$ have the same projection on $L^2(\Gamma \setminus G)$. We denote $R(k(\gamma)) \circ L(\gamma^{-1})f$ by f_γ. It is easy to see that f_γ is also supported on a single fundamental domain $\mathrm{T}^1(\gamma D_0)$, so we can also treat it as a function on $\Gamma \setminus G$. Moreover, f_γ is supported on $\gamma\Omega k(\gamma)^{-1} = n(\gamma)a(\gamma)(k(\gamma)\Omega k(\gamma)^{-1})$, and on $\gamma\Omega' k(\gamma)^{-1} = n(\gamma)a(\gamma)(k(\gamma)\Omega' k(\gamma)^{-1})$, $f_\gamma = 1$. If necessary, we may make Ω and Ω' smaller such that there exists two neighborhoods of identity $\Xi' \subset \Xi \subset D_0 \times K_\epsilon$, satisfying the following: for any $k \in K$, $\Xi' \subset k\Omega' k^{-1} \subset k\Omega k^{-1} \subset \Xi$. This can be done since the subgroup $K = \mathrm{SO}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is compact. Then for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, f_γ is supported on $n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi$ and on $n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi'$, $f_\gamma = 1$ (note that NA-component does not act on the K-component). Moreover, if we treat f_γ as a function on $\Gamma \setminus G$, $f_\gamma = R(k(\gamma))f$. Then we consider the evolution of f_γ under geodesic flow, say $R(a_t)f_\gamma$, where a_t is the diagonal element $\begin{bmatrix} e^t & \\ & e^{-t} \end{bmatrix}$. At first we regard $R(a_t)f_\gamma$ as a function on G, then $R(a_t)f_\gamma$ is supported on $n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi a_{-t}$, then if we project it to $\mathbb{H}^2 \cong G/K$, it is just the image of this subset acting on $\imath$. Take $\xi = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 & \omega_4 \end{bmatrix} \in \Xi$, then

$$n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\xi a_{-t}\imath \quad = \quad n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\tfrac{\omega_1\imath+\omega_2 e^{2t}}{\omega_3\imath+\omega_4 e^{2t}} \tag{37}$$

If we put $n(\gamma) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \chi(\gamma) \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, and $a(\gamma) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^{-1}(\gamma) & \\ & \lambda(\gamma) \end{bmatrix}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\tfrac{\omega_1\imath+\omega_2 e^{2t}}{\omega_3\imath+\omega_4 e^{2t}} \quad &= \quad \tfrac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2}\tfrac{\omega_1\imath+\omega_2 e^{2t}}{\omega_3\imath+\omega_4 e^{2t}} + \chi(\gamma) \\ &= \quad \tfrac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2}\tfrac{\omega_1\omega_3+\omega_2\omega_4 e^{4t}}{\omega_3^2+\omega_4^2 e^{4t}} + \chi(\gamma) + \imath\tfrac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2}\tfrac{e^{2t}}{\omega_3^2+\omega_4^2 e^{4t}} \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

If necessary, we can make Ω and Ω' smaller such that for each $\xi = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 & \omega_4 \end{bmatrix} \in \Xi$, we have $\frac{e^{2t}}{\omega_3^2+\omega_4^2 e^{4t}} \in [\frac{3}{4}e^{-2t}, \frac{4}{3}e^{-2t}]$ and $\frac{\omega_1\omega_3+\omega_2\omega_4 e^{4t}}{\omega_3^2+\omega_4^2 e^{4t}} \in [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$ for $t \geq 10$. Then we have that the projection of $n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi a_{-t}$ onto $G/K \cong \mathbb{H}^2$ is contained in

$$\left\{ x + y\imath : |x - \chi(\gamma)| \leq \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2} \text{ and } y \in \left[\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2 e^{2t}}, \frac{4}{3}\frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2 e^{2t}} \right] \right\} \tag{39}$$

Now we consider the inner product of $R(a_t)f_\gamma$ and $L(\gamma'^{-1})f_\gamma$ for some $\gamma' \in \Gamma$. Then from our choice of f, we know that

$$\int_G R(a_t)f_\gamma \cdot L(\gamma'^{-1})f_\gamma d\mu_G(g) \leq \mu_G(\gamma' n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi \cap n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi a_{-t}) \tag{40}$$

Since G is semisimple and so unimodular, then μ_G is both left and right invariant. Therefore,

$$\mu_G(\gamma' n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi \cap n(\gamma)a(\gamma)\Xi a_{-t}) = \mu_G(g(\gamma, \gamma')\Xi \cap \Xi a_{-t})$$

where $g(\gamma, \gamma') = a(\gamma)^{-1}n(\gamma)^{-1}\gamma' n(\gamma)a(\gamma)$.

In [7], the following proposition is proved:

Proposition 3.1. *See [7, Proposition 3.2] Let G be a real algebraic group, and σ is an involution of G. Let $A = \{a_t\}$ be a one parameter subgroup of G, such that $\sigma(a_t) = a_{-t}$. Let*

$$\begin{array}{ll} H = \{g \in G : \sigma(g) = g\} & U^+ = \{g \in G : a_{-t} g a_t \to e \text{ as } t \to \infty\} \\ U^- = \{g \in G : a_t g a_{-t} \to e \text{ as } t \to \infty\} & Z = Z_G(A) \end{array} \tag{41}$$

Then there exist constant c and t_0 such that for neighborhoods $H_{r_1} \subset H$, $Z_{r_2} \subset Z$ and $U^+_{r_3}$ of e in H, Z and U^+, respectively, small enough, $t > t_0$ and any $g \in G$, we have

$$\mu_G(gU^+_{r_3} Z_{r_2} H_{r_1} \cap U^+_{r_3} Z_{r_2} H_{r_1} a_{-t}) \leq ce^{-2t} \mu_{U^+}(U^+_{r_3})^2 \tag{42}$$

where μ_{U^+} denotes the Haar measure on U^+.

To apply the above proposition, we put $G = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\sigma(g) = (g^t)^{-1}$, then $H = K$, $Z = A$ and $U^+ = N$. Therefore from the above proposition we have that:

$$\int_G R(a_t) f_\gamma \cdot L(\gamma'^{-1}) f_\gamma d\mu_G(g) \leq \mu_G(g(\gamma, \gamma')\Xi \cap \Xi a_{-t}) \leq ce^{-2t} \mu_N(N_r)^2$$

where N_r is some small neighborhood of e in N, determined by Ξ. Combining this with the fact that $f_\gamma = 1$ on $\Xi' \subset \Xi$, we have $\|f_\gamma\|_2^2 \geq \mu_G(\Xi') \geq c'\mu_N(N_r)^2$. Therefore, the following statement holds:

Proposition 3.2. *There exist constants $\tilde{c}$ and t_0 such that for $t > t_0$,*

$$\int_G R(a_t) f_\gamma \cdot L(\gamma'^{-1}) f_\gamma d\mu_G(g) \leq \tilde{c} e^{-2t} \|f_\gamma\|_2^2 \tag{43}$$

where $\| \cdot \|_2$ denotes the L^2-norm in $\mathrm{L}^2(G)$. Note that $\|f_\gamma\|_2 = \|f\|_2$ is independent of γ.

On the other hand, we can also treat f_γ and $R(a_t) f_\gamma$ as functions on $\Gamma \setminus G$. We will apply the following theorem due to Moore:

Theorem 3.1. *See [8, Theorem 1.1] Let M be a Riemann surface of constant negative curvature equal to -1 of finite volume, and let $\mathrm{T}^1(M)$ be the unit tangent bundle of M. Let φ and ψ be in $L^2(\mathrm{T}^1(M))$ orthogonal to the constants, and satisfying the Hölder condition in the fiber direction for some $\alpha > 1/2$. Then if g_t is the geodesic flow, we have*

$$|(g_t^* \varphi, \psi)| \leq Le^{-c|t|} \tag{44}$$

where c depends only on M and L depends on the Hölder norms of φ and ψ.

In the above theorem, the Hölder condition of φ in the fiber direction for α is defined as follows: for every $x \in \mathrm{T}^1(M)$, if we define $H(\varphi)(x) = \sup_{t \in K} \frac{|t^*\varphi(x) - \varphi(x)|}{|t|^\alpha}$, where $|t|$ denotes some translate invariant norm on K, then $H(\varphi) \in L^2(\mathrm{T}^2(M))$, and the Hölder norm of φ is defined to be $\sqrt{\|\varphi\|_2^2 + \|H(\varphi)\|_2^2}$.

Here $\mathrm{T}^1(M)$ is the same as $\Gamma \setminus G$, the geodesic flow acting on $L^2(\Gamma \setminus G)$ is the same as $R(a_t)$ action, and from the equivalence between Hölder norm and Sobolev norm, we have the following:

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma \setminus G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t) f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma \setminus G} - \int_{\Gamma \setminus G} f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma \setminus G} \int_{\Gamma \setminus G} R(a_t) f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma \setminus G} \right| \leq L\mathcal{S}(f_\gamma)^2 e^{-c|t|} \tag{45}$$

where L and c depend only on Γ. Combining with $\mathcal{S}(f_\gamma) \leq \kappa\mathcal{S}(f)$ and $\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}$, we have

$$\left|\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} - \left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2\right| \leq L'\mathcal{S}(f)^2 e^{-c|t|} \tag{46}$$

where L' and c depend only on Γ. Note that $\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}$, we have

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} \geq \left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2 - L'\mathcal{S}(f)^2 e^{-c|t|} \tag{47}$$

Therefore, there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that for $t > T_0$,

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} \geq \frac{9}{10}\left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2 \tag{48}$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} = \sum_{\gamma'\in\Gamma}\int_G L(\gamma')f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_G \tag{49}$$

Here, on the right hand side, we treat f_γ and $R(a_t)f_\gamma$ as functions on G.

Define

$$N(t,\gamma) = \left\{\gamma' \in \Gamma : \int_G L(\gamma')f_\gamma \cdot R(t)f_\gamma d\mu_G > 0\right\} \tag{50}$$

Then from Proposition 3.2, we have that:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G} & = & \sum_{\gamma'\in\Gamma}\int_G L(\gamma')f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_G \\ & = & \sum_{\gamma'\in N(t,\gamma)}\int_G L(\gamma')f_\gamma \cdot R(a_t)f_\gamma d\mu_G \\ & \leq & |N(t,\gamma)|ce^{-2t}\|f\|_2^2 \end{array} \tag{51}$$

where $|N(t,\gamma)|$ denotes the number of elements in $N(t,\gamma)$. Therefore we have

$$|N(t,\gamma)|ce^{-2t}\|f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{9}{10}\left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2 \tag{52}$$

Therefore

$$|N(t,\gamma)| \geq \frac{9}{10}\left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2 \frac{1}{c\|f\|_2^2}e^{2t} \tag{53}$$

Now, for a fixed cusp $\gamma\infty$, we may choose a representative $\gamma \in \gamma\Gamma_\infty$, such that if $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix}\gamma_1 & \gamma_2\\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4\end{bmatrix}$, then $|\gamma_4| < |\gamma_3|$. This can be done since for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\begin{bmatrix}\gamma_1 & \gamma_2\\ \gamma_3 & \gamma_4\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & n\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\gamma_1 & n\gamma_1+\gamma_2\\ \gamma_3 & n\gamma_3+\gamma_4\end{bmatrix}$, then we can choose suitable n such that the condition above is satisfied. Then for any $\gamma' \in N(t,\gamma)$, we have $\gamma'^{-1}\gamma\Omega k(\gamma)^{-1} \cap \gamma\Omega k(\gamma)^{-1}a_{-t} \neq \emptyset$. Every element on the right hand side corresponds to an element $(x+y\imath, \frac{v}{y^2}) \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^2)$, where $x+y\imath$ is contained in the set described in (39) and v is very close to i. And on the right hand side if we denote $\gamma" = \gamma'^{-1}\gamma = \begin{bmatrix}\gamma"_1 & \gamma"_2\\ \gamma"_3 & \gamma"_4\end{bmatrix}$, then there exists $\omega \in \Omega$ close to e such that $\gamma"\omega k(\gamma)^{-1} = (x+y\imath, \frac{v}{y^2})$, where v is very close to i. Then if we consider the NAK-decomposition of $\gamma'' = n(\gamma'')a(\gamma'')k(\gamma'')$, then $k(\gamma'')$ is very close to $k(\gamma)$. Then we put $k(\gamma) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta) & \sin(\theta) \\ -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{bmatrix}$, and $k(\gamma'') = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta'') & \sin(\theta'') \\ -\sin(\theta'') & \cos(\theta'') \end{bmatrix}$, it is easy to check that $\tan(\theta) = -\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_4}$ and $\tan(\theta'') = -\frac{\gamma''_3}{\gamma''_4}$. So from our previous choice of γ we have $|\gamma''_4| < |\gamma''_3|$. Moreover, $\gamma''\iota = \frac{\gamma''_1\iota+\gamma''_2}{\gamma''_3\iota+\gamma''_4} = \frac{\gamma''_1\gamma''_3+\gamma''_2\gamma''_4}{\gamma''^2_3+\gamma''^2_4} + \iota\frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3+\gamma''^2_4}$, if we put $\gamma''_4 = k\gamma''_3$, then $|k| < 1$, and thus

$$\frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3 + \gamma''^2_4} = \frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3}\frac{1}{1+k^2} \in [\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3}, \frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3}] \tag{54}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{\gamma''_1}{\gamma''_3} - \frac{\gamma''_1\gamma''_3+\gamma''_2\gamma''_4}{\gamma''^2_3+\gamma''^2_4}| &= \frac{|\gamma''_4|}{(\gamma''^2_3+\gamma''^2_4)|\gamma''_3|} \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma''^2_3}\frac{k}{1+k^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\gamma''^2_3} \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

The same holds for γ also. And since $\gamma\iota = \chi(\gamma) + \iota\frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2}$, we have $|\chi(\gamma) - \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_3}| < \frac{1}{2\gamma_3^2}$ and $\frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2} \in [\frac{1}{2\gamma_3^2}, \frac{1}{\gamma_3^2}]$. Therefore for any $\gamma' \in N(t,\gamma)$, if we set $\gamma'' = \gamma'^{-1}\gamma$, then $|\gamma''\infty - \chi(\gamma)| \leq \frac{1}{4\lambda(\gamma)^2} + \frac{1}{2\|\gamma''\infty\|^2}$ and $\|\gamma''\infty\|^2 \in [\frac{3}{8}\lambda(\gamma)^2e^{2t}, \frac{4}{3}\lambda(\gamma)^2e^{2t}] \subset [\frac{3}{8}\|\gamma\infty\|^2e^{2t}, \frac{8}{3}\|\gamma\infty\|^2e^{2t}]$. For $t > 10$, we have $|\gamma''\infty - \chi(\gamma)| < \frac{1}{2\lambda(\gamma)^2}$, and since $|\chi(\gamma) - \gamma\infty| < \frac{1}{2\lambda(\gamma)^2}$, then $|\gamma''\infty - \gamma\infty| < \frac{1}{\lambda(\gamma)^2} \leq \frac{1}{\|\gamma\infty\|^2}$.

Then if the interval I is of form $[\gamma\infty - \frac{1}{\|\gamma\infty\|^2}, \gamma\infty + \frac{1}{\|\gamma\infty\|^2}]$ for some cusp point $\gamma\infty$, and $h = \|\gamma\infty\|e^t$ and $c_1 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}$ and $c_2 = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}$, then from the previous argument, we have that there exists some constant $R = \frac{9}{10}\left(\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f d\mu_{\Gamma\backslash G}\right)^2 \frac{1}{c\|f\|_2^2}$, such that

$$|\{\gamma''\infty \in I : \|\gamma''\infty\| \in [c_1h, c_2h]\}| \geq Re^{2t} = \frac{1}{2}Rh^2|I| \tag{56}$$

where $|I|$ denotes the length of I.

Remark: this is a generalization of [3, Theorem 2] from $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ to any lattice Γ.

At the end of the section, we prove a basic fact concerning cusp points: for any interval I of length $|I| \asymp \frac{1}{X}$, there exists at least one cusp point $\gamma a_i \in I$ with $\|\gamma a_i\| \leq X$, for all large $X > 0$.

In fact, for an interval $I = [x - cX^{-1}, x + cX^{-1}]$, where c is a constant to be determined, we consider the spectrum of x, say $\{\gamma(n)a(n)\}$, and take the last one $\gamma(m)a(m)$ in it with height $\|\gamma(m)a(m)\| \leq X$, then we claim that $\gamma(m)a(m) \in I$. By 29, we have $|x - \gamma(m)a(m)| \asymp \frac{1}{\|\gamma(m)a(m)\|\|\gamma(m+1)a(m+1)\|}$, for $\|\gamma(m+1)a(m+1)\| > X$, we have $|x - \gamma(m)a(m)| < cX^{-1}$ for some constant c. Then we choose this constant in our previous description of I. To sum up, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. *There exists a constant c only depending on the space $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, such that, for any large number $X > 0$ and any interval I of length $2c$, there exists at least one cusp point $\gamma a_i \in I$ with $\|\gamma a_i\| \leq X$.*

4 GEODESIC FLOWS ON PRODUCT SPACE $\Gamma_1\backslash\mathbb{H}^2\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k\backslash\mathbb{H}^2$

4.1 LOWER BOUND

For product of hyperbolic two dimensional spaces, $\Gamma_1 \setminus \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, where $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k \subset \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ are lattices of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, i.e., $M_i = \Gamma_i \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$ admits a finite $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ invariant volume. Then the geodesic flow $g_t(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$, where $(x_1 \ldots, x_k) \in M_1 \times \cdots, \times M_k$ corresponds to the point $\Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus (\iota, \ldots, \iota)u(x_1) \times \cdots \times u(x_k)$, with $u(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, corresponds to the projection of the following geodesic flow of $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{H}^2$ onto $M_1 \times \cdots \times M_k$:

$$\mathcal{G}_{(x_1 \ldots x_k)} = \left\{(x_1 + \frac{\iota}{e^{2s}}, \ldots, x_k + \frac{\iota}{e^{2s}}) \in \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{H}^2 : s \in \mathbb{R}\right\} \tag{57}$$

For each x_i we define $W_{x_i}(t) = \frac{1}{\max(\|\gamma a_i\|^2 e^{-2t}, \|\gamma a_i\|^2 |x_i - \gamma a_i|^2 e^{2t})}$ where γa_i is the cusp point of Γ_i which $x_i + e^{-2t}\iota$ is close to. From our previous calculation it is easy to see that $W_{x_i}(t) \asymp \mathfrak{W}_{x_i}(t) = \mathfrak{I} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{l_i}^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{l_i}}{a_i} & \sqrt{l_i} \end{bmatrix} \gamma^{-1}(x_i + e^{-2t}\iota)$. Then for the product space, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$, we define $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max_{1 \le i \le k} W_{x_i}(t)$. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is divergent, i.e., for any compact subset $K \subset M_1 \times \cdots \times M_k$, there exists a constant T depending on K, such that for any $t > T$, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is always outside K, if and only if $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

At first, we consider the case when $k = 2$. as we have done in the previous section, we suppose that $\{\gamma(n)a(n)\}$ and $\{\gamma'(m)a'(m)\}$ are the spectra of x_1 and x_2 respectively, and $\{t_n\}$ and $\{t'_m\}$ are the sequences of cusp-changing times for x_1 and x_2 respectively, i.e., for x_1 (and for x_2 respectively,), when $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$ (and $t \in [t'_m, t'_{m+1})$ respectively), we have $W_{x_1}(t) = \frac{1}{\max(\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{-2t}, \|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 |x_1 - \gamma(n)a(n)|^2 e^{2t})}$, (and $W_{x_2}(t) = \frac{1}{\max(\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2 e^{-2t}, \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2 |x_2 - \gamma'(m)a'(m)|^2 e^{2t})}$ respectively). In the previous section we have proved that $e^{2t_n} \asymp \|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2$ (and $e^{2t'_m} \asymp \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2$ respectively). Then for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, we can find a sequence of times $\{\tau_i\}$ such that at each time $t = \tau_i$, $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ admits local minimum. Then when $t = \tau_i$, either $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ changes from $W_{x_1}(t)$ to $W_{x_2}(t)$ or it changes conversely. Suppose the formal happens, then suppose $\tau_i \in [t_n, t_{n+1}) \cap [t'_m, t'_{m+1})$, since we assume that $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ changes from $W_{x_1}(t)$ to $W_{x_2}(t)$, we have on the left of τ_i $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ is decreasing and on the right it is increasing. That means on the left of τ_i, $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = W_{x_1}(t) = \frac{1}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 |x_1 - \gamma(n)a(n)|^2 e^{2t}}$ and on the right of τ_i $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = W_{x_2}(t) = \frac{1}{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2 e^{-2t}}$, thus at $t = \tau_i$ we have the following:

$$\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{2\tau_i} |x_1 - \gamma(n)a(n)|^2 = \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2 e^{-2\tau_i}$$

Then this value is equal to their geometric mean, i.e.,

$$\sqrt{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^2 e^{2\tau_i} |x_1 - \gamma(n)a(n)|^2 \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|^2 e^{-2\tau_i}} = \|\gamma(n)a(n)\| \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\| |x_1 - \gamma(n)a(n)|$$

We have proved that $|x - \gamma(n)a(n)| \asymp \frac{1}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\| \|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|}$, therefore the above value is asymptotically equal to $\frac{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}{\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|}$. So we have

$$W_{\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i) \asymp \frac{\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\|}{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}$$

. Similarly, if the latter happens, then

$$W_{\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i) \asymp \frac{\|\gamma'(m+1)a'(m+1)\|}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}$$

Then $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \to \infty$ if and only if $W_{\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i) \to \infty$ and this happens if and only if

$$\max(\frac{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}, \frac{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}) \to \infty$$

as $\min(\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|, \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|) \to \infty$. In other words, given any large number M, their exists some number R such that for any spectral cusp $\gamma(n)a(n)$ of x_1 and $\gamma'(m)a'(m)$ of x_2, if $\min(\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|, \|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|) \geq R$, then

$$\max(\frac{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}, \frac{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}) \geq M$$

In this section, we will prove the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *For any $x_1 \in \Delta_\sigma$ for $\Gamma_1 \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, then the set $D(x_1) = \{x_2 \in \mathbb{R} : \mathcal{G}_{(x,y)}$ is divergent $\}$ has Hausdorff dimension* 1.

We also quote the following result from [2]:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and E its projection onto the x-axis. For each $x \in E$, let L_x be the line $\{(x, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. If $\dim_H(F \cap L_x) \geq t$ for all $x \in E$, then*

$$\dim_H F \geq t + \dim_H E$$

This is Lemma 4.1 in [2] and Corollary 7.12 in [6].

Combining the above two propositions, we have the following:

Proposition 4.3. *If we define $D_2 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is divergent $\}$, then we have:*

$$\dim_H D_2 \geq \frac{3}{2}$$

Then for any product space $\Gamma_1 \setminus \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, since we just need $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max(W_{x_1}(t), \ldots, W_{x_k}(t)) \to \infty$ (as $t \to \infty$), and this happens if we have $\max(W_{x_1}(t), W_{x_2}(t)) \to \infty$ (as $t \to \infty$). This shows the Hausdorff dimension of $D_k = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is divergent $\}$ is at least $\dim_H D_2 + (k-2)$ (i.e., we just need $\mathcal{G}_{(x_1,x_2)}$ to be divergent and let other components be chosen arbitrarily).

Summing up, assuming Proposition 4.1, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Let D_k be defined as above, then we have*

$$\dim_H D_k \geq k - \frac{1}{2} \tag{58}$$

Now the only thing we need to do is to prove Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. For a fixed $x_1 \in \Delta_\sigma$, suppose $\{\gamma(n)a(n)\}$ is the refined sequence of cusps of x_1, such that

1. $\|\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)\| \in [\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^{1+\sigma}, 2\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|^{1+\sigma}]$
2. From $\mathcal{G}_{x_1}$ leaving $\gamma(n)a(n)$ to entering $\gamma(n+1)a(n+1)$, it spends at most s_0.

Let $q_n = \|\gamma(n)a(n)\|$, $h_n = \frac{q_n}{\ln q_n}$ and $h'_n = q_n \ln q_n$. We start from some n_0 large enough. We choose a cusp $\gamma'(n_0)\infty$ such that $\|\gamma'(n_0)\infty\| \in [c_1 h_{n_0}, c_2 h_{n_0}]$, where c_1, c_2 are given in previous section. And we define $F_{n_0} = I_{n_0}$ to be $[\gamma'(n_0)\infty - p\frac{1}{q_{n_0}^2}, \gamma'(n_0)\infty + p\frac{1}{q_{n_0}^2}]$, where $p \geq 1$ is a constant to be chosen later. Suppose F_n is already defined and is a union of finitely many disjoint closed intervals each of which is of form $[\gamma'(n)\infty - p\frac{1}{q_n^2}, \gamma'(n)\infty + p\frac{1}{q_n^2}]$, where $\|\gamma'(n)\infty\| \in [c_1 h_n, c_2 h_n]$. Then we construct F_{n+1} as follows:

We start with a closed interval of F_n, say $I_n = [\gamma'(n)\infty - \frac{1}{q_n^2}, \gamma'(n)\infty + \frac{1}{q_n^2}]$, We take γ is of form $\gamma'(n)u_1(k)s_j$, where $u_1(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & k \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_\infty$ and $s_j = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_j & \beta_j \\ \tau_j & \rho_j \end{bmatrix} \in S$, then $\|\gamma\infty\| = |k\tau_j\gamma'_3(n) + \alpha_j\gamma'_3(n) + \tau_j\gamma'_4(n)|$, where $\gamma'(n) = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma'_1(n) & \gamma'_2(n) \\ \gamma'_3(n) & \gamma'_4(n) \end{bmatrix}$ and $\|\gamma'(n)\infty\| = |\gamma'_3(n)|$. We can choose k appropriately such that $\|\gamma\infty\| \in [h'_n - Ch_n, h'_n + Ch_n]$ where C is some constant depending on Γ_2. For n large enough we have $\frac{\|\gamma\infty\|}{h'_n}$ is very close to 1. And from the result we have proved, there exists a constant C such that $|\gamma'(n)\infty - \gamma\infty| \leq \frac{C}{\|\gamma'(n)\infty\|\|\gamma\infty\|} \leq \frac{C'}{q_n^2}$, where C' is a constant very close to C. Then we can choose p properly such that $I' = [\gamma\infty - \frac{1}{\|\gamma\infty\|^2}, \gamma\infty + \frac{1}{\|\gamma\infty\|^2}] \subset I$. Then from the result of previous section we have the following

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\{\gamma''\infty \in I' : \|\gamma''\infty\| \in [c_1 h_{n+1}, c_2 h_{n+1}]\}| &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}R|I'|h_{n+1}^2 \\
&= R\frac{h_{n+1}^2}{(h'_n)^2} \\
&= R\left(\frac{q_{n+1}}{q_n \ln q_n \ln q_{n+1}}\right)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{59}
$$

For each such γ'', we define a closed interval $I_{n+1} = [\gamma''\infty - p\frac{1}{q_{n+1}^2}, \gamma''\infty + p\frac{1}{q_{n+1}^2}]$, and define F_{n+1} to be the union of all such intervals. Using the notation in Theorem 2.1, we can take $m_j = (\frac{q_j}{q_{j-1}\ln q_j \ln q_{j-1}})^2$, and from what we have proved, the gap between two intervals I_j and I'_j of F_j is at least $Const.\frac{1}{h_j^2} \asymp \frac{(\ln q_j)^2}{q_j^2}$, so we can take $\epsilon_j = \frac{(\ln q_j)^2}{q_j^2}$. Then if we define $F = \bigcap_{j \geq n_0} F_j$, according to Theorem 2.1, we have

$$
\dim_H F \quad \geq \quad \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\ln m_{n_0}\cdots m_{j-1}}{-\ln(m_j\epsilon_j)} \tag{60}
$$

Since $m_j = (\frac{q_j}{q_{j-1}\ln q_j \ln q_{j-1}})^2$, then $\ln m_j = 2\ln q_j - 2\ln q_{j-1} - 2\ln\ln q_j - 2\ln\ln q_{j-1}$, in the computation of the limit we can ignore the terms $-2\ln\ln q_j$ and $-2\ln\ln q_{j-1}$ for they are much smaller than $\ln q_j$ and $\ln q_{j-1}$. Then $\ln m_{n_0}\cdots m_{j-1}$ can be estimated by $\sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} 2\ln q_i - 2\ln q_{i-1} = 2\ln q_{j-1} - 2\ln q_{n_0-1} \asymp 2\ln q_{j-1}$, for j large. And $-\ln(m_j\epsilon_j) = -\ln(\frac{(\ln q_j)^2}{q_j^2}\frac{q_j^2}{q_{j-1}^2(\ln q_j)^2(\ln q_{j-1})^2}) = 2\ln q_{j-1} + 2\ln\ln q_{j-1} \asymp 2\ln q_{j-1}$. So when j is large enough, $\frac{\ln m_{n_0}\cdots m_{j-1}}{-\ln(m_j\epsilon_j)} \asymp \frac{2\ln q_{j-1}}{2\ln q_{j-1}} = 1$, and thus,

$$
\limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\ln m_{n_0}\cdots m_{j-1}}{-\ln(m_j\epsilon_j)} = 1 \tag{61}
$$

This proves that $\dim_H F = 1$.

On the other hand, for any $x_2 \in F = \bigcap_{j\geq n_0} F_j$, $x_2 \in I_j = [\gamma'(j)\infty - p\frac{1}{q_j^2}, \gamma'(j)\infty + p\frac{1}{q_j^2}]$, for each j, and $\|\gamma'(j)\infty\| \in [c_1 h_j, c_2 h_j]$. Then from our previous discussion about geodesic flows on $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$ and distance between a limit point and a cusp, we have that $\mathcal{G}_{x_2}$ enters the cusp $\gamma'(j)\infty$ at some moment and moreover, the next cusp $\mathcal{G}_{x_2}$ enters has height $\asymp \frac{q_j^2}{h_j} = h'_j$. Then if we consider the pair (x_1, x_2), for $x_1 \in \Delta_\sigma$, any cusp of x_1 has height near $\|\gamma(n)a(n)\| = q_n$ for some n, and near q_n, the largest cusp of x_2 smaller than q_n is near (up to a constant multiplication) $h_n = \frac{q_n}{\ln q_n}$, and the smallest cusp of x_2 larger than q_n is near (up to a constant multiplication) $h'_n = q_n \ln q_n$, this implies that for any cusp $\gamma'(m)a'(m)$ of x_2 whose height is large enough,

$$\max(\frac{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}, \frac{\|\gamma'(m)a'(m)\|}{\|\gamma(n)a(n)\|}) \gg \ln q_n \to \infty \tag{62}$$

This shows that $F \subset D(x_1)$. Combining this with $\dim_H F = 1$, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.1. ☐

4.2 UPPER BOUND

In this subsection, we will prove the following:

Theorem 4.2. *For some small number $\delta > 0$, if we define:*

$$E_k(\delta) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) > \delta^{-1} \text{ for any } t > 0\} \tag{63}$$

Then there exists some small constant δ_0 depending on k and the product space $\Gamma_1 \setminus \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, such that for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$

For $k = 2$, we have

$$\dim_H E_2(\delta) \leq \frac{3}{2} + \delta^{1/3} \tag{64}$$

And for $k \geq 3$, we have: we have

$$\dim_H E_k(\delta) \leq k - 1/2 + \delta^{1/6} \tag{65}$$

Remark: this theorem is a generalization of the first part of [2, Theorem 6.1], and the main idea of its proof is the same, but from the case when $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ to general case when Γ is any lattice, we have some difficulties to overcome. Here we follow the paper of Cheung to deal with the case $k = 2$ and $k \geq 3$ separately, since they are different in some essential manner.

In general, for any lattice $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, we use notations $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ to denote the cusp points of Γ in $\mathbb{R} \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^2$. We want to give an upper bound of the number of cusp points lying in some interval I with heights bounded by X. In particular, we will prove the following statement:

Proposition 4.4. *Given an interval I and a positive number X, we have*

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in Q(I,X)} \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{b}\|} \ll X|I| \tag{66}$$

where $Q(I, X) = \{\mathfrak{b} \text{ is a cusp point } : \mathfrak{b} \in I, \|\mathfrak{b}\| \leq X\}$ and $|I|$ denotes the length of I.

Proof. Take all cusps lying in I with height less than or equal to X and order them from small to large, say $Q(I,X) = \{\mathfrak{b}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,N}$ with $\mathfrak{b}_i < \mathfrak{b}_{i+1}$ for all i. From what we have proved, $\mathfrak{b}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{b}_i \gg \frac{1}{||\mathfrak{b}_{i+1}||||\mathfrak{b}_i||}$, then there exists some $c > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{b}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{b}_i \geq \frac{c}{||\mathfrak{b}_{i+1}||||\mathfrak{b}_i||}$. Combining $||\mathfrak{b}_{i+1}|| \leq X$, we have

$$\mathfrak{b}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{b}_i \geq \frac{c}{X||\mathfrak{b}_i||}$$

Take the summation for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have

$$\mathfrak{b}_N - \mathfrak{b}_1 \geq \frac{c}{X} \sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in Q(I,X)} \frac{1}{||\mathfrak{b}||}$$

For $\mathfrak{b}_N - \mathfrak{b}_1 \leq |I|$, we have that

$$|I| \geq \frac{c}{X} \sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in Q(I,X)} \frac{1}{||\mathfrak{b}||}$$

And this leads to our conclusion. ☐

Then for a fixed interval I if we define $F_I(X) = |Q(I,X)|$, then the above statement implies that

$$\int_{t \leq X} \frac{1}{t} dF_I(t) \ll |I|X$$

If we define $G_I(X) = \int_{t \leq X} \frac{1}{t} dF_I(t)$, then $dG_I(t) = \frac{1}{t} dF_I(t)$ and $G_I(X) \ll |I|X$.

With this estimate, we are ready to follow Cheung's proof in [2].

Case $k = 2$: For the product space $\Gamma_1 \backslash \mathbb{H}^2 \times \Gamma_2 \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$, we define $Q_i \subset \mathbb{R} \subset G/P$ to be the set of cusps of $\Gamma_i \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$, for $i = 1, 2$, and we define $\mathfrak{Q} = Q_1 \times Q_2$. For $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2) \in \mathfrak{Q}$, we define $B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)$ to be the neighborhood of $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)$ consisting of points whose ith component is within the $\frac{1}{||\mathfrak{a}_1||||\mathfrak{a}_2||}$ neighborhood of $\mathfrak{a}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ denote the subset of $\mathfrak{Q}$ consisting of the elements satisfying the following conditions:

$$||\mathfrak{a}_1|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}_2|| \quad \text{or} \quad ||\mathfrak{a}_2|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}_1|| \tag{67}$$

For any $(\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2) \in \mathfrak{I}$, we define $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2) \subset \mathfrak{I}$ to be the collection of elements $(\mathfrak{a}'_1, \mathfrak{a}'_2) \in \mathfrak{I}$ such that

Case 1 if $||\mathfrak{a}_1|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}_2||$, then $\mathfrak{a}'_1 \vdash \mathfrak{a}_1$, $\mathfrak{a}'_2 \models \mathfrak{a}_2$, and $||\mathfrak{a}'_2|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}'_1||$

Case 2 if $||\mathfrak{a}_2|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}_1||$, then $\mathfrak{a}'_2 \vdash \mathfrak{a}_2$, $\mathfrak{a}'_1 \models \mathfrak{a}_1$, and $||\mathfrak{a}'_1|| < \delta ||\mathfrak{a}'_2||$

Here $\mathfrak{a}' \vdash \mathfrak{a}$ means there exists some vertical downward geodesic flow $\mathcal{G}_x$ entering $\mathfrak{a}$ and leaving it for $\mathfrak{a}'$ and $\mathfrak{a}' \models \mathfrak{a}$ means there exists some vertical downward geodesic flow $\mathcal{G}_x$ entering $\mathfrak{a}$ and then entering $\mathfrak{a}'$ after a while (but $\mathfrak{a}'$ might not be the very next cusp point $\mathcal{G}_x$ leaves $\mathfrak{a}$ for).

We recall the definition of self-similar covering of some subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$:

Definition 4.1. *See [2, Definition 5.1 and Definition 5.2]*

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a countable covering of a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ by bounded subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and assume that it is indexed by some countable set $\mathfrak{I}$; let σ be a function from the set $\mathfrak{I}$ to the set of all nonempty subsets of $\mathfrak{I}$. For any $\alpha \in \mathfrak{I}$ we write $B(\alpha)$ for the element of $\mathcal{B}$ indexed by α. We say $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{I}, \sigma)$ is an indexed self-similar covering of E if there exists a λ, $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that for every $x \in E$ we have a sequence (α_j) of elements in $\mathfrak{I}$ satisfying

1. $\cap B(\alpha_j) = \{x\}$

2. $\mathrm{diam}B(\alpha_{j+1}) < \lambda \mathrm{diam}B(\alpha_j)$ *for all j, and*

3. $\alpha_{j+1} \in \sigma(\alpha_j)$ *for all j.*

where diam*B denotes the diameter of set B.*

Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the collection of all subsets of form $B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)$ where $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2) \in \mathfrak{I}$, We will prove that $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{I}, \sigma)$ is a self-similar covering of $E_2(\delta)$. In the following reasoning, for simplicity, we treat $A \asymp B$ the same as $A = B$, and treat $A \ll B$ ($A \gg B$ respectively) the same as $A \leq B$ ($A \geq B$ respectively), i.e., we ignore the constant multiplications in estimate, this simplicity does not effect the final result.

In fact, for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in E_2(\delta)$, then we have $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max(E_{x_1}(t), E_{x_2}(t)) > \delta^{-1}$ for all $t > 0$. And moreover, there is a sequence of times $\{t_n\}$ consisting of all local maxima of $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$. Take any t_n, and without loss of generality, we assume that $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t_n) = W_{x_1}(t_n)$. Suppose at $t = t_n$, $\mathcal{G}_{x_1}$ is near $\mathfrak{a}_n$ and denote its next cusp point by $\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}$. Then $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{n+1}) = W_{x_2}(t_{n+1})$, and if at this time $\mathcal{G}_{x_2}$ is near $\mathfrak{b}_n$, then from our previous discussion on the properties of $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$, we have that between t_n and t_{n+1}, there is a unique local minimum τ_n of $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ and $W_{x_1}(\tau_n) = W_{x_2}(\tau_n) \asymp \frac{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|}{\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|}$. Then since $\mathbf{x} \in E_2(\delta)$, we have $\frac{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|}{\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|} > \delta^{-1}$, i.e., $\|\mathfrak{b}_n\| < \delta \|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|$. And from the choice of $\mathfrak{a}_n$ and $\mathfrak{b}_n$, we have

$$|x_1 - \mathfrak{a}_{n+1}| \leq \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|^2} < \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|}$$

Moreover, when $t = t_{n+1}$, $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{n+1}) = W_{x_2}(t_{n+1})$, and at this time, $\mathcal{G}_{x_2}$ is near $\mathfrak{b}_n$, and we denote its next cusp by $\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}$, and if we consider the next local minima t_{n+2}, we have $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{n+2}) = W_{x_1}(t_{n+2})$, and suppose at this time $\mathcal{G}_{x_1}$ is near cusp $\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}$, then $\mathfrak{a}_{n+2} \models \mathfrak{a}_{n+1}$, so $\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}\| \gg \|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|$, and at the unique minimum τ_{n+1} of $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ between t_{n+1} and t_{n+2} we have $W_{\mathbf{x}}(\tau_{n+1}) \asymp \frac{\|\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}\|}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}\|} > \delta^{-1}$. This means $\|\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}\| > \delta^{-1}\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}\| > \|\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}\| \gg \|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|$, therefore,

$$|x_2 - \mathfrak{b}_n| \asymp \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|\|\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}\|} \leq \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|}$$

From the above argument, we have $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_n)$, and for the same reason, $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}, \mathfrak{b}_{n+1})$, thus $\mathbf{x} \in \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} B(\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_n)$. Moreover, we have $\mathfrak{a}_{n+2} \models \mathfrak{a}_{n+1}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{n+1} \vdash \mathfrak{b}_n$, so $(\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}, \mathfrak{b}_{n+1}) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_n)$. Finally, it is easy to see that

$$\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}, \mathfrak{b}_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+2}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}\|} < \delta \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_n\|} = \delta \mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_n)$$

Combining all the facts we get above, we conclude that $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{I}, \sigma)$ is a self-similar covering of $E_2(\delta)$.

To get the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of $E_2(\delta)$, we need the following theorem proved in [2].

Theorem 4.3. *(See [2, Theorem 5.3])*

Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{I}, \sigma)$ be an indexed self-similar covering of a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and suppose there is an $s > 0$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{I}$

$$\sum_{\alpha' \in \sigma(\alpha)} (diamB(\alpha'))^s \leq (diamB(\alpha))^s \tag{68}$$

Then $\dim_H E \leq s$.

For a subset $B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2) \in \mathcal{B}$, its diameter $diamB(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2) \asymp \frac{1}{||\mathfrak{a}_1||||\mathfrak{a}_2||}$. Then for every $(\mathfrak{a}'_1, \mathfrak{a}'_2) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)$,

$$\frac{diamB(\mathfrak{a}'_1, \mathfrak{a}'_2)}{diamB(\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2)} \asymp \frac{||\mathfrak{a}_1||||\mathfrak{a}_2||}{||\mathfrak{a}'_1||||\mathfrak{a}'_2||}$$

$$\sum_{(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)} \left(\frac{diamB(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)}{diamB(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)}\right)^s \asymp \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)} \left(\frac{||\mathfrak{a}_1||||\mathfrak{a}_2||}{||\mathfrak{a}'_1||||\mathfrak{a}'_2||}\right)^s \tag{69}$$

For symmetry, we assume that $||\mathfrak{a}_1|| < \delta||\mathfrak{a}_2||$, if we put $\frac{||\mathfrak{a}'_1||}{||\mathfrak{a}_1||} = a$ and $\frac{||\mathfrak{a}'_2||}{||\mathfrak{a}_2||} = b$, then from the definition of $\mathfrak{I}$, we have $a > \delta^{-2}$ and for fixed $a > 0$, then $b < \delta a$. Then for fixed $a > \delta^{-2}$, since $\mathfrak{a}'_1 \vdash \mathfrak{a}_1$, there are at most $\tilde{C}$ choices of $\mathfrak{a}'_1$ such that $\frac{||\mathfrak{a}'_1||}{||\mathfrak{a}_1||} \in [a, a+1)$, where $\tilde{C}$ is a constant. Since we ignore all the constant multiplications and treat them as 1 we may treat $\tilde{C} = 1$. Note that $\mathfrak{a}' \models \mathfrak{a}$ implies $|\mathfrak{a}' - \mathfrak{a}| \ll ||\mathfrak{a}||^{-2}$. We define

$$C(\mathfrak{a}_2, X) = \{\mathfrak{b} \text{ is a cusp of } \Gamma_2 : |\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{a}_2| < ||\mathfrak{a}_2||^{-2} : ||\mathfrak{b}|| \leq X||\mathfrak{a}_2||\}$$

And define $F(X) = |C(\mathfrak{a}_2, X)|$, and $G(X) = \int_{t\leq X} \frac{1}{t} dF(t) = ||\mathfrak{a}_2|| \int_{t\leq X} \frac{1}{t||\mathfrak{a}_2||} dF(t)$, then from Proposition 4.4, we have

$$G(t) \leq ||\mathfrak{a}_2|| \frac{t||\mathfrak{a}_2||}{||\mathfrak{a}_2||^2} = t$$

Then for any $s \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)} \left(\frac{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)}{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)}\right)^s &\asymp \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)} \left(\frac{||\mathfrak{a}_1||||\mathfrak{a}_2||}{||\mathfrak{a}'_1||||\mathfrak{a}'_2||}\right)^s \\ &\leq \sum_{a>\delta^{-2}} \frac{1}{a^s} \int_{b\leq\delta a} \frac{1}{b^{s-1}} dG(b) \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Here for the integral we apply integration by parts and the fact $G(b) \leq b$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b\leq\delta a} \frac{1}{b^{s-1}} dG(b) &= \frac{1}{(\delta a)^{s-1}} G(\delta a) - \int_{b\leq\delta a} G(b) db^{1-s} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\delta a)^{s-1}} G(\delta a) + (s-1) \int_{b\leq\delta a} b^{-s} G(b) db \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(\delta a)^{s-1}} (\delta a) + (s-1) \int_{b\leq\delta a} b^{-s} b db \\ &= (\delta a)^{2-s} + (s-1) \int_{b\leq\delta a} b^{1-s} db \\ &= (\delta a)^{2-s} + \frac{s-1}{-s+2} (\delta a)^{2-s} \\ &= \frac{1}{2-s} (\delta a)^{2-s} \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

We plug it into (70), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)} \left(\frac{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}'_1,\mathfrak{a}'_2)}{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2)}\right)^s &= \sum_{a>\delta^{-2}} \frac{1}{a^s} \frac{1}{2-s} (\delta a)^{2-s} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{2-s}}{2-s} \sum_{a>\delta^{-2}} a^{2-2s} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{2-s}}{2-s} \frac{1}{2s-3} (\delta^{-2})^{3-2s} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{3s-4}}{(2-s)(2s-3)} \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Then for $s = \frac{3}{2} + \delta^{\frac{1}{3}}$, then $\frac{\delta^{3s-4}}{(2-s)(2s-3)} \asymp \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\frac{1}{2} 2\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}} = \delta^{\frac{1}{6}}$, thus for $\delta < 2^{-7}$, the above sum is less than 1. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.2

Case $k > 2$: the same as above, let Q_i denote the set of cusp points of $\Gamma_i \setminus \mathbb{H}^2$, and we define $\mathfrak{Q}(k) = Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_k \times \{1, \ldots, k\} \times \{1, \ldots, k\}$. For each fixed $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $X > 0$, from Proposition 3.3, we may choose a subset $Q(X, i) = \{\gamma(n, X, i)a(n, X, i)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset Q_i$ such that

$$-\infty < \cdots < \gamma(0, X, i)a(0, X, i) < \gamma(1, X, i)a(1, X, i) < \cdots < \gamma(n, X, i)a(n, X, i) < \cdots < +\infty$$

with $\gamma(n+1, X, i)a(n+1, X, i) - \gamma(n, X, i)a(n, X, i) \asymp X^{-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and moreover, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we may choose the cusp $\gamma(n, X, i)a(n, X, i) \in Q(X, i)$ nearest x such that $|x - \gamma(n, X, i)a(n, X, i)| \ll X^{-1}$. With this we define the subset $\mathfrak{I} \subset \mathfrak{Q}(k)$ consisting of elements $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \in \mathfrak{Q}(k)$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$||\mathfrak{a}_j|| < \sqrt{\delta}||\mathfrak{a}_i|| \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{a}_l \in Q(||\mathfrak{a}_i||||\mathfrak{a}_j||, l) \text{ for } l \neq i, j \tag{73}$$

And for each $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \in \mathfrak{I}$, we define $B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j)$ to be the neighborhood of $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k)$ whose lth component is within the $\frac{1}{||\mathfrak{a}_i||||\mathfrak{a}_j||}$ neighborhood of $\mathfrak{a}_l$. And let $A(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \subset B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j)$ be its subset consisting of elements whose ith component is within the $\frac{1}{||\mathfrak{a}_i||^2}$ neighborhood of $\mathfrak{a}_i$. We denote $\mathcal{B}$ by the collections of all subsets of form $B(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j)$ where $(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \in \mathfrak{I}$. Then we define $\sigma(\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \subset \mathfrak{I}$ to be the subset consisting of elements $(\mathfrak{a}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}'_k, j, l) \in \mathfrak{I}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\mathfrak{a}'_j \vdash \mathfrak{a}_j$
2. $||\mathfrak{a}_i|| < ||\mathfrak{a}'_j||$ and $||\mathfrak{a}_j|| < ||\mathfrak{a}'_l||$
3. $A(\mathfrak{a}_1 \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_k, i, j) \cap A(\mathfrak{a}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}'_k, j, l) \neq \emptyset$
4. $||\mathfrak{a}_i||^2 < ||\mathfrak{a}_j||||\mathfrak{a}_l||$

We may show that $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{I}, \sigma)$ is a self-similar covering of $E_k(\delta)$.

In fact, for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in E_k(\delta)$, we consider the function $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} W_{x_i}(t)$. Then there is a sequence of times $\{t_p\}$ such that $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ admits local maxima at each t_p. Suppose $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t_p) = W_{x_{i(p)}}(t_p)$, then if $\mathfrak{a}_{i(p)}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}$ be the cusps of $x_{i(p)}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{x_{i(p)}}$ enters the formal one right before time t_p and enters the latter one right after time t_p. From the property of $W_x(t)$, we have $t_p = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{|x_{i(p)} - \mathfrak{a}_{i(p)}|} \asymp \frac{1}{2} \ln ||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p)}||||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}||$. Between t_p an t_{p+1}, there is a unique local minimum of $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ at $t = \tau_p$, and from our previous discussion concerning $W_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$, we have $\tau_p \asymp \frac{1}{2} \ln ||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p+1)}||||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}||$ and $W_{\mathbf{x}}(\tau_p) \asymp \frac{||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}||}{||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p+1)}||}$, then since $\mathbf{x} \in E_k(\delta)$ we have $||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p+1)}|| < \delta||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}||$.

We choose a subsequence of $\{(\mathfrak{a}_{i(p)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}, i(p))\}$ as follows: given $(\mathfrak{a}_{i(p_l)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(p_l)}, i(p_l))$, we define p_{l+1} to be the smallest p such that $||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p_l)}||^2 < ||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p)}||||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p+1)}||$, then we have $||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p_l)}||^2 < ||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p_{l+1})}||||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p_{l+2})}||$, and moreover we have

$$||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p_l)}||^2 \geq ||\mathfrak{b}_{i(p_{l+1}-1)}||||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p_{l+1})}|| \geq \delta^{-1}||\mathfrak{a}_{i(p_{l+1})}||^2$$

For simplicity, we write $(\mathfrak{a}_{i(l)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}, i(l))$ instead of $(\mathfrak{a}_{i(p_l)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(p_l)}, i(p_l))$, then we have

$$||\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}|| \leq \sqrt{\delta}||\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}|| \quad \text{and} \quad ||\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}||^2 < ||\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}||||\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}|| \tag{74}$$

and moreover $\mathfrak{a}_{i(l)}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}$ are consecutive cusps in the spectrum of $x_{i(l)}$.

Then for each l, we define $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) \in \mathfrak{J}$ as follows: $\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)} = \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}$, $\mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)} = \mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}$, and for other subindex l, we choose $\mathfrak{c}_l$ to be the cusp in $Q(\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)}\|\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)}\|, l)$ nearest x_l. Then we have $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) \in \mathfrak{J}$. And moreover, since $\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}$ are consecutive cusps in the spectrum of $x_{i(l+1)}$, we have

$$|x_{i(l+1)} - \mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}| \asymp \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}\|} < \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\|} = \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)}\|}$$

And also we have

$$|x_{i(l)} - \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}| \ll \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)}\|^2}$$

For other subindex l, we have $|x_l - \mathfrak{c}_l| < \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)}\|\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)}\|}$ from our choice of $\mathfrak{c}_l$. Therefore we have

$$\mathbf{x} \in A(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) \subset B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$$

Since $\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$, we have $\bigcap_l B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) = \{\mathbf{x}\}$

Next, we need to check that $(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2)) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$ where $(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2))$ is the element in $\mathfrak{J}$ defined as above for $l+1$. In fact, at first, we have $\mathfrak{c}'_{i(l+1)} = \mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)} \vdash \mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)} = \mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)}$. Secondly, we have $\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)} = \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}$, $\mathfrak{c}'_{i(l+1)} = \mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}$, $\mathfrak{c}_{i(l+1)} = \mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}$ and $\mathfrak{c}'_{i(l+2)} = \mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}$, from our definition of $(\mathfrak{a}_{i(l)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}, i(l))$, we have $\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\| < \|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}\|$ and $\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}\| < \|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}\|$. Also, $\mathbf{x} \in A(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) \cap A(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2))$ implies it is not empty. Finally, from our construction, we have

$$\|\mathfrak{c}_{i(l)}\|^2 = \|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\|^2 < \|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}\| = \|\mathfrak{c}'_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_{i(l+2)}\|$$

Therefore $(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2))$ satisfies all conditions of $\sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$, this shows that $(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2)) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$.

Finally we have to show that there exists a constant λ such that

$$\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2)) < \lambda \operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$$

In fact, $\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2)) = \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}\|}$ and $\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1)) = \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\|\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}\|}$, and from our construction of $(\mathfrak{a}_{i(l)}, \mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}, i(l))$, we have

$$\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\| < \sqrt{\delta}\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l)}\|^2 < \sqrt{\delta}\|\mathfrak{b}_{i(l+1)}\|\|\mathfrak{a}_{i(l+2)}\|$$

Then we have

$$\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, i(l+1), i(l+2)) < \sqrt{\delta} \operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i(l), i(l+1))$$

Summing up all argument above, we have $(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{J}, \sigma)$ is a self-similar covering of $E_k(\delta)$.

Next for some fixed $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j) \in \mathfrak{J}$, in order to apply Theorem 4.3, for some $s > 0$, we need to estimate the following summation:

$$\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, j, l) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, j, l)}{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j)} \right)^s \tag{75}$$

For fixed subindex l, we define

$$\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j) = \{(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, j, l) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j)\} \subset \sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j)$$

At first, we study the summation

$$\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{c}'_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}'_k, j, l)}{\mathrm{diam}B(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k, i, j)}\right)^s$$

for fixed subindex l.

In fact, the above is equal to

$$\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}\right)^s$$

We put $\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|} = a$ and $\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|} = b$, then we have $a > \delta^{-1}$ and $b < \sqrt{\delta}a$. Since $\mathfrak{c}'_j \vdash \mathfrak{c}_j$, for fixed a, the number of cusps of $\mathfrak{c}'_j$ such that $\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|} = a$ is $\ll 1$, then we may treat it as 1. And since $|\mathfrak{c}'_l - \mathfrak{c}_l| < \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}$, we define

$$C(l, X) = \{\mathfrak{c}'_l : |\mathfrak{c}'_l - \mathfrak{c}_l| < \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|} \text{ and } \|\mathfrak{c}'_l\| \le X\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\}$$

And put $F(X) = |C(l, X)|$, and $G(X) = \int_{t\le X} \frac{1}{t} dF(t)$, from Proposition 4.4, we have

$$G(X) = \|\mathfrak{c}_i\| \int_{t\le X} \frac{1}{t\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|} dF(t) \le \|\mathfrak{c}_i\| \frac{X\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|} = X\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}$$

Moreover, for fixed $\mathfrak{c}'_j$ and $\mathfrak{c}'_l$, and for any other subindex $m \ne i$, the cusp $\mathfrak{c}'_m$ must be inside the $\frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}$ and moreover $\mathfrak{c}'_m \in Q(\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|, m)$, there are at most $\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}$ choices for $\mathfrak{c}'_m$, but for the subindex i, we have that $\mathfrak{c}'_i$ is within the $\frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|^2}$ neighborhood of $\mathfrak{c}_i$, and $\mathfrak{c}'_i \in Q(\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|, i)$, there are at most $\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|^2} = \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)\left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}\right)$ choices for $\mathfrak{c}'_i$. Therefore, suppose $s \in (k - \frac{1}{2}, k)$, the above summation is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}\right)^s &= \sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_j,\mathfrak{c}'_l)} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}\right)^s \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)^{k-2} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}\right) \sum_{a>\delta^{-1}} \frac{1}{a^{s-k+2}} \int_{b\le\sqrt{\delta}a} \frac{1}{b^{s-k+2}} dF(b) \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Using the same argument as in case $k = 2$, combining the fact $G(b) \le b\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b\le\sqrt{\delta}a} \frac{1}{b^{s-k+2}} dF(b) &= \int_{b\le\sqrt{\delta}a} b^{k-1-s} dG(b) \\ &= G(\sqrt{\delta}a)(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-1-s} - \int_{b\le\sqrt{\delta}a} G(b) db^{k-1-s} \\ &\le \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)(\sqrt{\delta}a)(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-1-s} + (s+1-k)\int_{b\le\sqrt{\delta}a} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right) b b^{k-2-s} db \\ &= \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-s} + \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right) \frac{s+1-k}{k-s}(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-s} \\ &= \frac{1}{k-s}\left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-s} \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Plug the above into the summation (76), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}'_j\|\|\mathfrak{c}'_l\|}\right)^s &\leq \left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}\right)\textstyle\sum_{a>\delta^{-1}} \frac{1}{a^{s-k+2}}\frac{1}{k-s}\left(\frac{\|\mathfrak{c}_i\|}{\|\mathfrak{c}_j\|}\right)(\sqrt{\delta}a)^{k-s} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{(k-s)/2}}{k-s}\textstyle\sum_{a>\delta^{-1}} a^{2k-2s-2} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^{(k-s)/2}}{k-s}\frac{\delta^{2s+1-2k}}{2s+1-2k} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{3/2(s-k)+1}}{(k-s)(2s+1-2k)} \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Then for δ small enough and for $s = k - 1/2 + \delta^{1/6}$, then we have $\frac{\delta^{3/2(s-k)+1}}{(k-s)(2s+1-2k)} \asymp \frac{\delta^{1/4}}{\delta^{1/6}} = \delta^{1/12} \ll 1$. Let l go over all subindex except j and take the summation of all

$$\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)}{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)}\right)^s$$

We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)}{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)}\right)^s &= \textstyle\sum_{l\neq j}\sum_{(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)\in\sigma_l(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}'_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}'_k,j,l)}{\operatorname{diam} B(\mathfrak{c}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{c}_k,i,j)}\right)^s \\ &\ll \textstyle\sum_{l\neq j} 1 \\ &\asymp 1 \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Thus we claim that there exists some δ_0 depending on k and the space $\Gamma_1 \backslash \mathbb{H}^2 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$ such that for all $\delta < \delta_0$, we have $\dim_H E_k(\delta) \leq k - 1/2 + \delta^{1/6}$.

This complete the proof.

Since $D_k \subset E_k(\delta)$, from $\dim_H E_2(\delta) \leq \frac{3}{2} + \delta^{1/3}$ and $\dim_H E_k(\delta) \leq k - 1/2 + \delta^{1/6}$. By letting $\delta \to 0$, we have $\dim_H D_k \leq k - 1/2$

Combing this with Proposition 4.3 we have the following:

Theorem 4.4. $\dim_H D_k = k - 1/2$

Combining all the theorems we get in this section with our discussion in Subsection 1.1, Theorem 1.1 is proved. ■

References

[1] A. Beardon, The geometry of discrete groups, Springer-Verlag (1983).

[2] Y. Cheung, Hausdorff dimension of the set of points on divergent trajectories of a homogeneous flow on a product space, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. **27** (2007), 65-85.

[3] Y. Cheung, Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic directions, Ann. of Math., **158** (2003), 661-178.

[4] Y. Cheung, Hausdorff dimension of the set of Singular Pairs. Annals of Math., **173**, (2011), 127-167.

[5] S.G. Dani, Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces, J. Reine Angew Math. **359** (1985), 55-89.

[6] K. Falconer, Fractal Geometry. Mathematical Foundations and Applications, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1990.

[7] A. Gorodnik, N. Shah, Khinchins theorem for approximation by integral points on quadratic varieties, Math. Annalen 350 (2011), no. 2, 357-380.

[8] C.C. Moore, Exponential decay of correlation coefficients for geodesic flows. Group representations, ergodic theory, operator algebras and mathematical physics. C.C. Moore, ed., MSRI Publ. 6, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[9] H. Masur, Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic foliations of a quadratic differential. Duke Math. Journal, **66** (1992), 387-442.

[10] H. Masur, J. Smillie, Hausdorff dimension of sets of nonergodic measured foliations. Ann. of Math., **134** (1991), 455-543.

[11] B. Weiss, Divergent trajectories on noncompact parameter spaces. Geom. Funct. Anal. **14** (2004), no. 1, 94-149.